

AGENDA

Meeting: Children's Services Select Committee
Place: Council Chamber, Monkton Park, Chippenham
Date: Thursday 9 June 2011
Time: 10.30 am

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Sharon Smith, of Democratic and Members' Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line (01225) 718378 or email sharonl.smith@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225) 713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Membership:

Cllr Christine Crisp	Cllr Russell Hawker
Cllr Paul Darby	Cllr Jon Hubbard
Cllr Andrew Davis	Cllr Jacqui Lay
Cllr Peter Davis	Cllr Bill Moss
Cllr Mary Douglas	Cllr Helen Osborn
Cllr Peter Fuller	Cllr Carole Soden
Cllr Mark Griffiths	

Substitutes:

Cllr Ernie Clark	Cllr Tom James MBE
Cllr Christopher Devine	Cllr John Knight
Cllr Peggy Dow	Cllr Jeff Osborn
Cllr Nick Fogg	Cllr William Roberts
Cllr Mollie Groom	

Non-Elected Voting Members:

Rev Alice Kemp	Parent Governor Representative (SEN)
Mr Neil Owen	Parent Governor Representative (Secondary)
Mrs Rosheen Ryan	Parent Governor Representative (Primary)
Dr Mike Thompson	Roman Catholic Church Diocesan Representative

Non-Elected Non-Voting Members:

Mrs Di Dale	Further Education Representative
Mr Chris Dark	Secondary Schools Headteacher Representative
Mrs Judith Finney	Primary School Headteachers Representative
John Hawkins	School Teacher Representative
Chris King	Children & Young People's Representative

PART I

Items to be considered while the meeting is opened to the public

1) **Election of Chairman**

To elect a Chairman of the Select Committee for 2011/2012.

Nominations will be sought orally from those present at the meeting. Voting will be by way of a show of hands.

2) **Election of Vice Chairman**

To elect a Vice-Chairman of the Select Committee for 2011/2012.

Nominations will be sought orally from those present at the meeting. Voting will be by way of a show of hands.

3) **Apologies and substitutions**

Apologies have been received from Carolyn Godfrey.

4) **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** *(Pages 1 - 6)*

To confirm and sign the minutes as a correct record of the Childrens' Services Select Committee meeting held on 17 March 2011.

5) **Declarations of Interests**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests or dispensations granted by the Standards Committee.

6) **Chairman's Announcements**

7) **Public Participation and Councillors Questions**

The Council welcomes contributions from members of the public.

Statements

If you would like to make a statement at this meeting on any item on this agenda, please register to do so at least 10 minutes prior to the meeting. Up to 3 speakers are permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes each on any agenda item.

Please contact the officer named above for any further clarification.

Questions

To receive any questions from members of the public or members of the Council received in accordance with the constitution. Those wishing to ask questions are required to give notice of any such questions in writing to the officer named above (acting on behalf of the Director of Resources) no later than **5pm on Thursday 2 June 2011**. Please contact the officer named on the first page of this agenda for further advice. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.

Details of any questions received will be circulated to Committee members prior to the meeting and made available at the meeting and on the Council's website.

8) **Coalition Update - May 2011** *(Pages 7 - 20)*

Carolyn Godfrey, Corporate Director for DCE, will present the update attached on the Coalition Government's proposals for children's services and education.

9) **Budget & Performance update**

Hard copies of the budget monitoring and performance papers for Cabinet's May meeting will be circulated on 6th June 2011.

Where possible, members are asked to forward any specific questions regarding the current DCE budget or performance position to the Senior Scrutiny Officer in advance of the meeting.

10) **Review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision - Update on Implementation** *(Pages 21 - 26)*

A report from the Corporate Director for the Department for Children & Education providing an update on progress with the implementation of the proposals relating to the Review of SEN Provision 2009/10.

In November 2010, the Committee received an update on how individual transition plans for those young people affected by the Review were being progressed. Members requested a further update six months hence.

The Manager for Inclusion will attend to answer members' questions.

11) **Update on the Strategic Direction of Small Schools** *(Pages 27 - 32)*

A report from the Corporate Director for the Department for Children & Education providing an update on the position in relation to small schools,

particularly in the primary phase. It highlights the developments and progress made and captures some of the emerging challenges in the light of the changing national and local policy development and sets out next steps.

The Head of School Improvement will attend to answer members' questions.

12) **Consultation on School Funding Reform** (Pages 33 - 68)

A report from the Corporate Director for the Department for Children & Education presenting Wiltshire's response to two consultations on school funding reform published by the Department for Education (DfE).

In the White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, the Government set out its view that the current school funding system is opaque, full of anomalies and unfair and therefore in need of reform. The Government has now consulted on the merits of a national funding formula to ensure a clearer, more transparent and fairer school funding system, including for Academies and Free Schools, based on the needs of pupils.

Wiltshire's responses to these consultations are attached to the report. In each case the response is a joint response from the Council and Schools Forum and it should be noted that the views of Schools Forum include the views of head teachers from both maintained schools and academies in Wiltshire.

13) **Scrutiny of Procurement & Commissioning** (Pages 69 - 72)

A report from the Designated Scrutiny Officer is attached proposing a revised approach to the scrutiny of procurement and commissioning.

In November, the Organisation & Resources Select Committee considered a report on the challenges faced by the Council in driving a more focused and professional approach into the Council's procurement and commissioning activities and outlined options on how best to scrutinise this area of work in the future. Following this, the O&S Liaison Board considered a report which provided details of a proposed approach to future scrutiny of procurement and commissioning. The Board resolved that future scrutiny would be dealt with by way of a dedicated Procurement and Commissioning Task Group, reporting directly to the Organisation & Resources Select Committee and replacing the Major Contract Task Groups. The proposed new approach has also now been approved by the Environment and Health & Adult Social Care Select Committees.

The Committee is now asked to consider and approve the recommendations provided within the attached report.

14) **Task Group Update** (Pages 73 - 76)

An update on Committee Task Group activity is attached.

15) **Forward Work Programme** *(Pages 77 - 84)*

A copy of the draft Forward Work Programme is attached for consideration.

16) **Date of Next Meeting**

22 July 2011.

17) **Urgent Items**

Any other items of business which the Chairman agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

PART II

Items during whose consideration it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed

NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

CHILDREN'S SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2011 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE.

Present:

Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Peter Davis, Cllr Peter Fuller, Cllr Mark Griffiths, Cllr Russell Hawker, Mr J Hawkins, Cllr Jon Hubbard, Rev. A Kemp, Cllr Jacqui Lay (Vice Chairman), Cllr Helen Osborn, Mrs R Ryan, Cllr Carole Soden (Chairman) and Dr M Thompson

Also Present:

Cllr Lionel Grundy, Cllr Alan Macrae and Cllr Sheila Parker

147. Apologies and substitutions

Apologies were received from Cllr Mary Douglas, Cllr Bill Moss and Mr Neil Owen.

148. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were signed and approved as a correct record.

149. Declarations of Interests

No declarations of interest were received.

150. Chairman's Announcements

1. DCE Restructuring

In January 2010, the Committee received details of DCE's new staffing structure following recent budget cuts. Following the meeting, John Hawkins, teacher representative, expressed concern that the matter had been raised under Chairman's announcements rather than under a separate agenda item.

Mr Hawkins subsequently met with the Corporate Director for DCE and several other officers to discuss his concerns. Mr Hawkins thanked the

officers for answering his questions, but asked the Committee to continue to monitor the impact of the cuts.

The Chairman noted that it was not within the remit of the Committee to scrutinise organisational structures but that officers had agreed to keep the Committee informed on the matter.

2. Deferred Items

The Small Schools Strategy was deferred in November 2010 whilst the Committee awaited clarification on the national policy. Although this was now beginning to emerge, the next few months were likely to provide more clarity on the direction that officers should take. A report would be considered at the Committee's meeting in June 2011.

151. Public Participation

There was no public participation.

152. Coalition Changes – DCE update

The Corporate Director for the Department for Children and Education introduced an update report on the latest changes from central government.

Members were asked to note the interim report by Graham Allen MP, 'Early Intervention: The Next Steps', the recommendations of which were circulated at the meeting.

A summary of Professor Eileen Munro's interim report on child protection was given. The final report would be produced in April 2011.

The Government's green paper, 'Support and Aspirations: A New Approach to Special Education Needs and Disability' was circulated. The Committee had previously agreed to undertake a rapid scrutiny task group giving a response to this consultation document. The paper was likely to lead to a more parent-focused system and include a single assessment process resulting in a single plan for the life of a young person up to age 25. The revised system was also expected to address the current situation where children who may simply have fallen behind are classified as having SEN through the designations of School Action and School Action Plus.

The Committee was asked to note that the Green Paper had referred to Wiltshire Council as an example of good practice, highlighting the positive work undertaken by the Department.

Ensuing discussion also included sixth form provision and the role of the English baccalaureate. Clarification was provided that the Department

continued to seek any funding that may be available through Central Government.

It was reported that further national funding was being made available to sixth form colleges, but Wiltshire would not receive any as it has no sixth form colleges. Members asked officers to explore whether further education colleges could receive a proportion of this funding.

It was estimated that by September 2011 approximately half of Wiltshire's secondary schools could be academies. Although there was an assumption that most academies would take over the services previously provided for them by the Council, several had expressed an interest in retaining the Council's support. It was noted that at present schools transferring to academy status were unable to transfer back to local authority control for seven years.

Resolved

To note the update.

153. **Budget & Performance monitoring**

A condensed version of the most recent Cabinet budget monitoring and performance reports, with information relating specifically to DCE, were circulated.

It was reported that following Central Government's announcement regarding the cessation of the previous indicator sets, DCE continued to investigate its own alternatives for monitoring performance.

Resolved:

To note the latest budget and performance data in relation to DCE.

154. **Transition Planning - update**

The Joint Service Director for Commissioning & Performance presented a report updating on progress to ensure effective transition from children's to adult's services. The Committee had last received a report in March 2010, when the focus had been on the implementation of the Multi-Agency Transition Protocol over the next 3 years.

The Chairman asked members to note that Transitions also fell within the scope of a systems thinking review of services for disabled children and adults, which formed part of the overarching corporate plan to achieve savings of £21.3m over the next four years. The Committee was asked to take this into consideration when setting its future work programme.

The Transitions Protocol, established following the Joint Area Review in 2008, had been recognised as representing good practice and had, as a result, also been adopted by other authorities. Specific note was made to the pilot of the Person Centred Reviews, which focused on the young person and their wishes and aspirations.

To support the Protocol it was important to ensure information was easily accessible to parents. This had been achieved through transitional events, web-based information and the publication of a handbook for parents.

Concerns were expressed over the attainment gap for children receiving free school meals and those with SEN where gaps had widened at both KS2 and KS4. To address this, the Department had implemented an intervention programme targeted at ages 5 to 6, which included one-to-one support. Results were already showing a significant improvement in attainment levels and the Corporate Director proposed that a future paper be submitted to the Committee providing further details of this work.

Resolved:

- 1. To note progress made on Transition Planning.**
- 2. That the Committee be kept informed of progress with the corporate review of services for disabled children.**

155. Scrutiny of the Business Plan 2011 – 2015

In February 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Liaison Board requested that the four Select Committees refer to the Council's recently adopted 4 year Business Plan in order to set their individual work programmes.

The Senior Scrutiny Officer presented a report identifying the content in the Business Plan that fell within the remit of the Committee. Following discussion, members agreed to the proposed methods for scrutinising each area.

Members also agreed that future agendas would include a framework providing detail on how the Committee was progressing with scrutinising each area.

Resolved:

- 1. To note that Council on 22 February 2011 adopted the 4 year Business Plan on recommendation from Cabinet;**
- 2. To note the decision of the Overview & Scrutiny Liaison Board on 10 February that work be undertaken to identify relevant content from the Business Plan for the individual select committees;**

3. **To agree the list of themes set out within the report but to acknowledge that further refinement would be made when more details emerged; and**
4. **To recognise the budget implications and demands on the leading scrutiny members in determining priorities and workload.**

156. **Placements for Looked After Children (LAC) Task Group**

The Senior Scrutiny Officer presented a report recapping on the work done by the Task Group since its formation in March 2010 and proposing its future direction.

The Placements for Looked After Children (LAC) Task Group was originally established to consider the new Commissioning Plan for Looked After Children (LAC), with an initial expectation that only one meeting would be required. Due to the variety of issues and services that are relevant to children in care, a further four meetings were held. These had enabled members of the Task Group to gain a good understanding of the challenges faced by LAC and those providing services or caring for them. At its meeting in February 2011, members of the Task Group had unanimously agreed that the Task Group should continue its work.

The Portfolio Holder for Schools reiterated the need for the Task Group to continue its work, particularly as the Corporate Parenting Panel had changed its approach and would no longer be undertaking 'scrutiny' work. Officers also confirmed that scrutiny involvement had proved beneficial to the Department.

Resolved:

To agree that the Placements for LAC Task Group continue its work with the terms of reference listed in paragraph 11 of the report and that it retain the current membership.

157. **Task Group update**

Updates on the work undertaken by individual Task Groups was provided with the Agenda with the following additional information provided:

Further Education in the Salisbury Area Task Group

The Task Group had met for the second time on 10th March 2010 and further statistical information had been considered. Members had noted that around 50% of Wiltshire residents receiving post-16 education did so outside of the County and that only a small proportion of this number received sixth form education. Further information was being sought as to why this was the case, taking into consideration that the national average was approximately 37%.

Major Contracts

Members noted the update provided within the Agenda.

Placements for Looked After Children (LAC) Task Group

Specific attention was drawn to a DVD produced by the Council to highlight the real experiences of Wiltshire children within the adoptions/fostering process and the importance of the services provided by the Council. The Committee agreed with the Task Group's recommendation that the DVD should be shown to all members at the next Full Council.

The Portfolio Holder for Vulnerable Children noted that the Corporate Parenting Panel's annual report was due to be presented at the next meeting of Full Council and that the DVD would link favourably to this item.

Rapid Scrutiny Exercise: Green Paper – Children & Young People with SEN and Disabilities

The Rapid Scrutiny Exercise would be undertaken following the recent publication of the Green Paper.

Special Schools and Post-16 SEN Task Group

The Task Group had now established its membership and the first meeting was to be arranged.

Resolved:

To note the updates provided.

158. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee would be 9 June 2011.

159. **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for discussion.

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 12.10 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Sharon Smith, of Democratic & Members' Services, direct line (01225) 718378, e-mail sharonl.smith@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee

9 June 2011

Coalition Changes – DCE update March–May 2011

Improving underperforming schools

1. Michael Gove has written to local authorities and academy sponsors asking for their plans to improve schools below the floor standards in their area. In practice:
 - A secondary school will be below the floor if fewer than 35 per cent of pupils achieve the standard of five GCSEs with grades A*-C including English and mathematics - raising the floor by five percentage points - and fewer pupils than the national average make the expected levels of progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 in English and mathematics.
 - A primary school will be below the floor if fewer than 60 per cent of pupils achieve the standard of Level 4 in both English and mathematics at Key Stage 2 - raising the floor from 55 percent - and fewer pupils than the national average make the expected levels of progress between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 in English and mathematics.
2. Local authorities had until 15 April to respond. In Wiltshire, there are 12 primary schools and no secondary schools in these categories.

Vocational Education

3. The independent [Wolf Review](#) into vocational education, commissioned by Education Secretary Michael Gove, has been published. Professor Wolf recommends a radical change of direction. There are four main principles for reform:
 - The system must stop 'tracking' 14 to 16 year olds into 'dead-end' courses.
 - The system must be made honest so young people are not pushed into damaging decisions.

- The system must be dramatically simplified to remove perverse incentives.
 - We should learn best practice from countries doing things better than us, such as Denmark, France and Germany.
4. Mr Gove said Prof Wolf's report was "brilliant and ground-breaking". He immediately accepted four of her recommendations:
- To allow qualified further education lecturers to teach in school classrooms on the same basis as qualified school teachers.
 - To clarify the rules on allowing industry professionals to teach in schools.
 - To allow any vocational qualification offered by a regulated awarding body to be taken by 14-to19-year-olds.
 - To allow established high-quality vocational qualifications that have not been accredited to be offered in schools and colleges in September 2011.
5. Mr Gove has now published the [government response](#) which states: "We will take action on all of Professor Wolf's individual recommendations, and in doing so, deliver on three key themes.
- Ensure that all young people study and achieve in English and mathematics, ideally to GCSE A*-C, by the age of 19. For those young people who are not immediately able to achieve these qualifications, we will identify high quality English and maths qualifications that will enable them to progress to GCSE later. We will also reform GCSE to ensure that they are a more reliable indicator of achievement in the basics, in particular by ensuring that GCSEs are reformed alongside our current review of the National Curriculum.
 - Reform performance tables and funding rules to remove the perverse incentives which have served only to devalue vocational education, while pushing young people into qualification routes that do not allow them to move into work or further learning. Those vocational qualifications that attract performance points will be the very best for young people – in terms of their content, assessment and progression.

- Look at the experience of other countries to simplify Apprenticeships, remove bureaucracy and make them easier for employers to offer.

Academies Update

	Date opened
Sponsored academies:	
The Wellington Academy	Sep 2009
Sarum Academy	Sep 2010
Non-sponsored academies:	
Hardenhuish	Sep 2010
Lavington	Jan 2011
South Wilts	Jan 2011
Bishop Wordsworth's	March 2011
Corsham Primary School	April 2011
The Corsham School	April 2011
Sheldon School	April 2011

Support and Aspiration: A New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability

6. Sarah Teather, Minister of State for Children and Families has launched a [Green Paper](#) on special educational needs and disability which makes wide-ranging proposals to respond to the frustrations of children and young people, their families and the professionals who work with them. The proposals will be consulted on until 30 June. She suggests:

- a new approach to identifying SEN through a single Early Years setting-based category and school-based category of SEN;
- a new single assessment process and Education, Health and Care Plan by 2014;
- local authorities and other services will set out a local offer of all services available;
- the option of a personal budget by 2014 for all families with children with a statement of SEN or a new Education, Health and Care Plan;
- give parents a real choice of school, either a mainstream or special school; and
- introduce greater independence to the assessment of children's needs.

Child Poverty

7. At the beginning of April the Government published its child poverty strategy – [“A New Approach to Child Poverty: Tackling the Causes of Disadvantage and Transforming Families’ Lives.”](#) This is the Government’s first national Child Poverty Strategy, setting out a new approach to tackling poverty for this Parliament and up to 2020. At its heart are strengthening families, encouraging responsibility, promoting work, guaranteeing fairness and providing support to the most vulnerable.

Independent Review on Capital Expenditure in Schools

8. Sebastian James, Group Operations Director at Dixons Retail plc, today published his independent **Capital Review**. Mr James reports: -

“In summary, I have found that the system of capital allocation and spending which has developed over at least the last decade has frequently resulted in poor use of resources, a bureaucratic system for providers and Local Authorities and a mixed – and at times poor - outcome for both parents and children.”

School Funding

9. Between 13 April – 25 May, the Government consulted on how school funding can be made fairer. As it stands, the school funding system creates large variations in how much money similar schools in different parts of the country receive. It sought the views of parents, teachers, schools, unions and local authorities about the current system, and asked whether a new system would result in a fairer outcome for schools. This is the first part of a two-stage process, further proposals will be published for consultation later this year.

Independent review into child protection – Munro report

10. On 10 May Professor Munro published her report [“A child-centred system”](#). Taken together, the recommendations cover the following key areas:

- radical reduction in the amount of central prescription to help professionals move from a compliance culture to a learning culture, where they have more freedom to assess need and provide the right help. Statutory guidance should be revised and the inspection process modified to give a clearer focus on children’s needs. Inspection should be unannounced;

- a change of approach to Serious Case Reviews (SCRs), with learning from the approach taken in sectors such as aviation and healthcare. There should be a stronger focus on understanding the underlying issues that made professionals behave the way they did and what prevented them from being able to properly help and protect children. The current system is too focused on what happened, not why;
- reform of social work training and placements with employers and Higher Education Institutions and doing more to prepare social work students for the challenges of child protection work. The work of the Social Work task Force and the Social Work Reform Board should be built upon to improve frontline expertise;
- each local authority should designate a Principal Child and Family Social Worker to report the views and experiences of the front line to all levels of management. At national level, a Chief Social Worker should be established to advise the Government on social work practice;
- local authorities and their statutory partners should be given a new duty to secure sufficient provision of early help services for children, young people and families, leading to better identification of the help that is needed and resulting in an offer of early help;
- affirmation of the importance of clear lines of accountability as set out in the Children Act 2004 and the protection of the roles of Director of Children's Services and Lead Members from additional functions, unless there are exceptional circumstances; and
- strengthened monitoring of the effectiveness of help and protection by Local Safeguarding Children Boards, including multi- agency training for safeguarding and child protection.

11. DfE Ministers have welcomed Professor Munro's thorough analysis of the issues. They want to consider carefully, with professionals, how best to respond to her proposals to bring about reform and expect to develop a response before the summer recess.

CAROLYN GODFREY

Corporate Director, Department for Children and Education

Report author: Lynda Cox, Head of Performance and Information Management, Department for Children and Education.

Largely taken from the DFE website.

Appendices

Appendix A

Executive Summary – The Munro Review of Child
Protection: Final Report – A child-centred system

Executive Summary

- 1 When the Secretary of State for Education commissioned this review of child protection in June 2010, a central question was ‘what helps professionals make the best judgments they can to protect a vulnerable child?’. This final report sets out proposals for reform which, taken together, are intended to create the conditions that enable professionals to make the best judgments about the help to give to children, young people and families. This involves moving from a system that has become over-bureaucratised and focused on compliance to one that values and develops professional expertise and is focused on the safety and welfare of children and young people.
- 2 The review began by using ‘systems’ theory to examine how the current conditions had evolved. The review’s first report in October 2010 described the child protection system in recent times as one that has been shaped by four key driving forces:
 - the importance of the safety and welfare of children and young people and the understandable strong reaction when a child is killed or seriously harmed;
 - a commonly held belief that the complexity and associated uncertainty of child protection work can be eradicated;
 - a readiness, in high profile public inquiries into the death of a child, to focus on professional error without looking deeply enough into its causes; and
 - the undue importance given to performance indicators and targets which provide only part of the picture of practice, and which have skewed attention to process over the quality and effectiveness of help given.
- 3 These forces have come together to create a defensive system that puts so much emphasis on procedures and recording that insufficient attention is given to developing and supporting the expertise to work effectively with children, young people and families.
- 4 The review’s second report, in February this year, considered the child’s journey through the child protection system – from needing to receiving help – to show how the system could be improved. It concluded that instead of “doing things right” (i.e. following procedures) the system needed to be focused on doing the right thing (i.e. checking whether children and young people are being helped). Extensive consultation on the reform areas set out in that report contributed to the development of this final report.

A system that values professional expertise

- 5 Practitioners and their managers told the review that statutory guidance, targets and local rules have become so extensive that they limit their ability to stay child-centred. The demands of bureaucracy have reduced their capacity to work directly with children, young people and families. Services have become so standardised that they do not provide the required range of responses to the variety of need that is presented. This review recommends a radical reduction in the amount of

central prescription to help professionals move from a compliance culture to a learning culture, where they have more freedom to use their expertise in assessing need and providing the right help.

- 6 The review is recommending that the Government revise statutory, multi-agency guidance to remove unnecessary or unhelpful prescription and focus only on essential rules for effective multi-agency working and on the principles that underpin good practice. For example, the prescribed timescales for social work assessments should be removed, since they distort practice. The underlying principle of timeliness is important and should be applied to the whole process of helping a child or young person, not just the early stage of assessment.
- 7 Inspection is a key influence on priorities in frontline practice so needs to support the change from a compliance to a learning culture. The review has worked closely with Ofsted to look at how inspection can focus on and measure what really matters – whether children have been helped. The review is confirming the recommendation made in its second report, that inspection should be conducted on an unannounced basis in order to minimise the bureaucratic burden. It also recommends that the inspection framework examines the effectiveness of the contributions of all local services, including health, education, police, probation and the justice system, putting the experiences of children, young people and their families at the heart of the inspection system.

Sharing responsibility for the provision of early help

- 8 Like the reviews led by Graham Allen MP, Dame Clare Tickell, and Rt Hon Frank Field MP, this review has noted the growing body of evidence of the effectiveness of early intervention with children and families and shares their view on the importance of providing such help. Preventative services can do more to reduce abuse and neglect than reactive services. Many services and professions help children and families so co-ordinating their work is important to reduce inefficiencies and omissions. The review is recommending the Government place a duty on local authorities and their statutory partners to secure the sufficient provision of local early help services for children, young and people and families. This should lead to the identification of the early help that is needed by a particular child and their family and to the provision of an offer of help where their needs do not match the criteria for receiving children’s social care services.
- 9 Within preventative and other services good mechanisms are needed to help identify those children and young people who are suffering, or likely to suffer, harm from abuse or neglect and who need referral to children’s social care. The association between child abuse and neglect and parental problems, such as poor mental health, domestic violence and substance misuse, is well established. It is not easy to identify abuse and neglect. Signs and symptoms are often ambiguous and so it is important that those working with children, young people and adults have ready access to social work expertise to discuss concerns and decide whether a referral to children’s social care is needed.

Developing social work expertise

- 10 The level of increased prescription for social workers, while intended to improve the quality of practice, has created an imbalance. Complying with prescription and

keeping records to demonstrate compliance has become too dominant. The centrality of forming relationships with children and families to understand and help them has become obscured. The review is making recommendations to enable social workers to exercise more professional judgment but is also concerned to improve their expertise. Building on the work of the Social Work Task Force (SWTF) and the Social Work Reform Board (SWRB), this review makes the case for radically improving the knowledge and skills of social workers from initial training through to continuing professional development. The review highlights the importance of social workers' use of research evidence to help them reach the most appropriate decisions.

- 11 The review has concluded that the high levels of prescription have also hampered the profession's ability to take responsibility for developing its own knowledge and skills. The SWTF and SWRB have laid the foundations for improving skills and have developed a generic Professional Capabilities Framework. For child and family social work, this review gives more detail of the capabilities relating to knowledge, critical reflection and analysis, and intervention and skills. The review recommends that these capabilities explicitly inform initial social work training, continuing professional development, performance appraisal and career structures.
- 12 Reform of the social work profession should significantly improve outcomes for children and young people by making best use of available evidence about what helps to resolve the problems in children's lives. Increasing the expertise of the workforce requires investment, but in areas where local reforms have upgraded the knowledge and skill of their workforce, savings have been seen overall. Skilled help can enable more children and young people to stay safely with their families, bringing significant savings. Initially resources will be required to develop the additional expertise and training necessary to set the profession off on a new path and this is an area that the review considers to be a priority for investment.

The organisational context: supporting effective social work practice

- 13 With the reduction of prescription, leaders in local authorities will have more autonomy but also more responsibility for helping their staff to operate with a high level of knowledge and skills. The review asks local authorities to take more responsibility for deciding the range of services they will offer, defining the knowledge and skills needed and helping the workers develop them. For example, a local authority wishing to implement a particular evidence-based way of working with children and families needs to consider what changes might be needed in the training, supervision, IT support and monitoring to enable this to be carried out effectively. To keep the focus on the quality of help being given to children and young people, they need to pay close attention to the views and experiences of those receiving services and the professionals who help them.
- 14 The review shares the view of the SWTF that the current career structure hampers the development of expertise, both in the individual and in the profession in general, because promotion leads too quickly to leaving direct work with children and families. A more varied career path and a stronger voice for practitioners in management is needed. The review recommends the designation, in each local authority, of a Principal Child and Family Social Worker, who is still doing direct

work, to advise on enhancing practice skills. This role would take responsibility for relating the views of social workers to those whose decisions affect their work.

- 15 The College of Social Work, which is being created on the recommendation of the SWTF, will play a major role in helping the profession build its knowledge and expertise. The review also considers that social work must have greater visibility and voice within Government. It is recommending the establishment of a Chief Social Worker, whose duties should include advising Government on social work practice and the effectiveness of help offered to children and young people.

Clarifying accountabilities and creating a learning system

- 16 A major challenge in building a more responsive child protection system is helping a wide range of professions to work together well in order to build an accurate understanding of what is happening in the child or young person's life, so the right help can be provided. Clear lines of accountability, and roles such as the Director of Children's Services and designated and named persons, are vitally important.
- 17 This review recommends that there continues to be clear lines of accountability as the Coalition Government's plans for reform in the public services are implemented. In particular, the review recommends that local authorities give due consideration to protecting the discrete roles and responsibilities of a Director of Children's Services and Lead Member for Children's Services before allocating any additional functions to individuals occupying such roles, asking whether alternative approaches allow sufficient focus and attention to be paid to the nation's most vulnerable children.
- 18 In moving to a system that promotes the exercise of professional judgment, local multi-agency systems will need to be better at monitoring, learning and adapting their practice. This review recommends regular review of cases becomes the norm and that the 'systems approach' used in the health sector is adopted and applied, in particular, to Serious Case Reviews. This will enable deeper learning to overcome obstacles to good practice.
- 19 Data on performance are an essential source of information for both managers and inspectors. The review sets out how local government and their partners should use a combination of nationally and locally collected performance information to help benchmark performance, facilitate improvement and promote accountability. Performance information should not be treated as a straightforward measure of good or bad practice but interrogated to see what lies behind it. A low number of children being removed from their birth families, for example, can arise from skilled help making the children safe or from a poor quality assessment of risk.

Implementation

- 20 In responding to this review, the Government should provide clarity around roles, responsibilities and accountabilities, and set out what goals the system should aim for, leaving professionals to judge how best to meet those goals. In the past, problems have too often led to more central prescription, culminating in the current over-proceduralised system. This review proposes an alternative view: that the system is complex and it is not possible to predict or control it with precision.

Feedback is the important mechanism for monitoring how the system is working, so that problems are seen early and efforts are made to resolve them.

- 21 The recommendations in this review are geared towards creating a better balance between essential rules, principles, and professional expertise. Helping children is a human process. When the bureaucratic aspects of work become too dominant, the heart of the work is lost. The recommendations are to be considered *together*, and the review cautions strongly against cherry picking some of the reforms to implement. Reducing prescription without creating a learning system will not secure the desired improvements in the system. On the other hand, delaying the reduction of prescription until services show they can take responsibility prevents them from demonstrating it. The review also cautions against taking a short-term approach to reform – the depth of change recommended in this report means it will take time for the necessary knowledge and skills to be developed and for experiences of new ways of working to accumulate to the point where they can be fully effective. Taken together, these reforms will redress the balance between prescription and the exercise of judgment so that those working in child protection are able to stay child-centred.

Summary of recommendations

Chapter three: A system that values professional expertise

Recommendation 1: The Government should revise both the statutory guidance, *Working Together to Safeguard Children* and *The Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and their Families* and their associated policies to:

- distinguish the rules that are essential for effective working together, from guidance that informs professional judgment;
- set out the key principles underpinning the guidance;
- remove the distinction between initial and core assessments and the associated timescales in respect of these assessments, replacing them with the decisions that are required to be made by qualified social workers when developing an understanding of children’s needs and making and implementing a plan to safeguard and promote their welfare;
- require local attention is given to:
 - timeliness in the identification of children’s needs and provision of help;
 - the quality of the assessment to inform next steps to safeguard and promote children’s welfare; and
 - the effectiveness of the help provided;
- give local areas the responsibility to draw on research and theoretical models to inform local practice; and
- remove constraints to local innovation and professional judgment that are created by prescribing or endorsing particular approaches, for example, nationally designed assessment forms, national performance indicators associated with assessment or nationally prescribed approaches to IT systems.

Recommendation 2: The inspection framework should examine the effectiveness of the contributions of all local services, including health, education, police, probation and the justice system to the protection of children.

Recommendation 3: The new inspection framework should examine the child's journey from needing to receiving help, explore how the rights, wishes, feelings and experiences of children and young people inform and shape the provision of services, and look at the effectiveness of the help provided to children, young people and their families.

Recommendation 4: Local authorities and their partners should use a combination of nationally collected and locally published performance information to help benchmark performance, facilitate improvement and promote accountability. It is crucial that performance information is not treated as an unambiguous measure of good or bad performance as performance indicators tend to be.

Chapter four: Clarifying accountabilities and improving learning

Recommendation 5: The existing statutory requirements for each Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) to produce and publish an annual report for the Children's Trust Board should be amended, to require its submission instead to the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council, and, subject to the passage of legislation, to the local Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chair of the health and wellbeing board.

Recommendation 6: The statutory guidance, *Working Together to Safeguard Children*, should be amended to state that when monitoring and evaluating local arrangements, LSCBs should, taking account of local need, include an assessment of the effectiveness of the help being provided to children and families (including the effectiveness and value for money of early help services, including early years provision), and the effectiveness of multi-agency training to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people.

Recommendation 7: Local authorities should give due consideration to protecting the discrete roles and responsibilities of a Director of Children's Services and Lead Member for Children's Services before allocating any additional functions to individuals occupying such roles. The importance, as envisaged in the Children Act 2004, of appointing individuals to positions where they have specific responsibilities for children's services should not be undermined. The Government should amend the statutory guidance issued in relation to such roles and establish the principle that, given the importance of individuals in senior positions being responsible for children's services, it should not be considered appropriate to give additional functions (that do not relate to children's services) to Directors of Children's Services and Lead Members for Children's Services unless exceptional circumstances arise.

Recommendation 8: The Government should work collaboratively with the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, the Royal College of General Practitioners, local authorities and others to research the impact of health reorganisation on effective partnership arrangements and the ability to provide effective help for children who are suffering, or likely to suffer, significant harm.

Recommendation 9: The Government should require LSCBs to use systems methodology when undertaking Serious Case Reviews (SCRs) and, over the coming year, work with the sector to develop national resources to:

- provide accredited, skilled and independent reviewers to jointly work with LSCBs on each SCR;
- promote the development of a variety of systems-based methodologies to learn from practice;
- initiate the development of a typology of the problems that contribute to adverse outcomes to facilitate national learning; and
- disseminate learning nationally to improve practice and inform the work of the Chief Social Worker (see chapter seven).

In the meantime, Ofsted's evaluation of SCRs should end.

Chapter 5: Sharing responsibility for the provision of early help

Recommendation 10: The Government should place a duty on local authorities and statutory partners to secure the sufficient provision of local early help services for children, young people and families. The arrangements setting out how they will do this should:

- specify the range of professional help available to local children, young people and families, through statutory, voluntary and community services, against the local profile of need set out in the local Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA);
- specify how they will identify children who are suffering or who are likely to suffer significant harm, including the availability of social work expertise to all professionals working with children, young people and families who are not being supported by children's social care services and specify the training available locally to support professionals working at the frontline of universal services;
- set out the local resourcing of the early help services for children, young people and families; and, most importantly
- lead to the identification of the early help that is needed by a particular child and their family, and to the provision of an "early help offer" where their needs do not meet the criteria for receiving children's social care services.

Chapter 6: Developing social work expertise

Recommendation 11: The Social Work Reform Board's Professional Capabilities Framework should incorporate capabilities necessary for child and family social work. This framework should explicitly inform social work qualification training, postgraduate professional development and performance appraisal.

Recommendation 12: Employers and higher education institutions (HEIs) should work together so that social work students are prepared for the challenges of child protection work. In particular, the review considers that HEIs and employing agencies should work together so that:

- practice placements are of the highest quality and – in time – only in designated Approved Practice Settings;
- employers are able to apply for special ‘teaching organisation’ status, awarded by the College of Social Work;
- the merits of ‘student units’, which are headed up by a senior social worker are considered; and
- placements are of sufficiently high quality, and both employers and HEIs consider if their relationship is working well.

Chapter 7: The organisational context: supporting effective social work practice

Recommendation 13: Local authorities and their partners should start an ongoing process to review and redesign the ways in which child and family social work is delivered, drawing on evidence of effectiveness of helping methods where appropriate and supporting practice that can implement evidence based ways of working with children and families.

Recommendation 14: Local authorities should designate a Principal Child and Family Social Worker, who is a senior manager with lead responsibility for practice in the local authority and who is still actively involved in frontline practice and who can report the views and experiences of the front line to all levels of management.

Recommendation 15: A Chief Social Worker should be created in Government, whose duties should include advising the Government on social work practice and informing the Secretary of State’s annual report to Parliament on the working of the Children Act 1989.

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee 9th June 2011

Review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision – Update on Implementation

Purpose of Report

1. To present a further update of progress on the implementation of the proposals relating to the Review of SEN Provision 2009/10.

Action required of the Committee

2. To note the report.

Background

3. On 28 January 2010, the Children's Services Select Committee considered proposals for SEN service development in relation to mainstream primary schools, Specialist Learning Centres (SLCs), special schools and SEN Support services. A full public consultation on the proposals was undertaken, with opportunities for written responses and attendance at public meetings.
4. On 8 June 2010, the Children's Services Select Committee resolved to undertake a rapid scrutiny exercise looking at the Review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision, as follows:
 - a. Rapid scrutiny of the Review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision consultation process
 - b. Rapid scrutiny of the Review of Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision consultation results
5. The Rapid Scrutiny Exercise was held on 15 July 2010. Its final report was then considered by the Select Committee on 22 July 2010, alongside the report to Cabinet presenting the outcomes of the Review and proposals for service development. The Select Committee endorsed all of the Rapid Scrutiny recommendations without amendment or addition.
6. Outcomes from the consultation were presented to Cabinet on 27 July 2010 and all the recommendations were agreed. This was reported to the Children's

Services Select Committee on 23 September 2010 where it was agreed that the Committee would be updated on progress. The Rapid Scrutiny Group received an update in November 2010 on how the individual transition plans for those young people affected were being progressed.

7. The Rapid Scrutiny Group requested a further update on implementation of the proposals relating to the Review of SEN Provision 2009/10 in June 2011.

Progress update on delegation of resources to schools

8. The delegation process has been completed and fully implemented.

From 1st April:-

- all primary schools in Wiltshire are able to meet the needs of pupils up to the equivalent of 10 hours of additional support covering all areas of need;

and

- all secondary schools in Wiltshire are able to meet the needs of pupils up to the equivalent of 15 hours of additional support covering all areas of need.

Progress update on the development of the SEN Inclusion Service and Inclusion Network

9. The corporate review of management resulted in a new management structure. It has been implemented from 1st April 2011 and become the basis of the new Inclusion Network for a range of support services with Targeted School and Learner Support.
10. The process of review of individual services is now under way. It is due to clarify and establish
 - the statutory functions
 - activity level which is likely to affect statutory functions
 - activity related to building school's capacity
11. The outcomes of these reviews will require further consultation with schools and relevant committees of the Schools' Forum in the Autumn 2011; this is to establish the financial commitment of schools to continue to provide these services by the Local Authority (the vast majority of the services under review are funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant).
12. This review is linked to a range of national DFE guidance on funding, SEN and Academies.

Progress update on the transitional arrangements for Specialist Learning Centres and individual pupils (all data based on 18/05/2011)

Centre Level

13. Since September 2010, in order to discuss and facilitate the transitional arrangements, each specialist learning centre has arranged on average 4 meetings each; in total schools held 83 planning meetings.
14. This work has been overseen by the Education Officers. In 28 cases, officers attended individual meetings; this represents 34% of all meetings held by schools. This is in addition to other regular communication between schools and the Local Authority.
15. This high level of involvement and monitoring allowed the LA and schools to communicate well. As a result placement or provision planning for all pupils has now been completed.

Pupils level

16. The position, as at 18th May 2010, in relation to progress on planning for individual pupils is set out in the table below.

Progress on planning for pupils

Pupils placement already resolved and Final statement issued naming a new provision	140
Pupils under Statutory Assessment	25
Pupils placement already resolved but they remain at School Action + (plus)	64
Pupils where a way forward has not been confirmed	0
Total number of pupils affected	229
Pupils where a way forward is under an appeal	1

17. Where the placement issues have been resolved and the final statement issued naming a new provision this is because:
 - The pupils already have a statement of SEN and their annual review made relevant recommendation with regard to the future placement;or
 - The pupils were referred for a statutory assessment by the school or their parent and the process has been completed;and
 - LA issued its final decision about the placement and therefore issued a final statement of SEN.

18. Where pupils are under statutory Assessment this is because:
- A school Action plus review meeting has taken place
- and
- A request for a statutory assessment has been made by the school or a parent and the process is under way.
19. Where pupils remain at School Action+(plus); this is because:
- A School Action+ (plus) review meeting has taken place
- and
- The level of need and provision does not require a referral for a Statutory Assessment
- and
- The type and level of provision has been agreed and put in place within the resources available at a school level.
20. Where a way forward has not been confirmed
- N/A (all confirmed)
21. Where a way forward is being appealed against; this is because
- The LA issued a final Statement of SEN naming a provision in part 4 of the pupil's statement
- and
- Parents are appealing against the decision taken by the LA.
22. The monitoring of progress in individual plans for pupils affected by the changes to Specialist Learning Centres (SLCs) and the processes for ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place for individual pupils, will continue to be monitored by officers from the Central SEN Team.

Risk Assessment

- 23 Progress on developing the SEN Inclusion Service and Inclusion Network will be affected by the national developments in the following areas;
- Green Paper on SEN and Disability

- White Paper – Importance of Teaching
- National review of the Educational Psychology Service
- National School funding consultation
- Expansion of the academies (incl special schools)

24 Some placements for pupils cannot be fully resolved until the completion of a Statutory Assessment. It is important to note that all these assessments have now been initiated and decisions about the level of provision and placements will be taken by the end of this academic year.

Conclusion

25. The implementation process for the Review of SEN Provision has been effectively managed to date and a process established to deliver effective transitional arrangements.

Action

26. Members are asked to note the report on the progress made with establishing individual plans for each pupil who is affected by changes to Specialist Learning Centres (SLCs).

Carolyn Godfrey, Corporate Director of Children's Services

Report Author: Karina Kulawik
Manager for Inclusion – 01225 713655

Background Papers: None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee

9th June 2011

Update on the Strategic Direction of Small Schools

Purpose of Report

1. This report provides an update on the position in relation to small schools, particularly in the primary phase. It highlights the developments and progress made; it captures some of the emerging challenges in the light of the changing national and local policy development and sets out next steps.

Background

2. The Strategy for Addressing Issues Facing Small Schools in Wiltshire was presented to Cabinet in 2005. The report identified the increasing challenges facing small schools including:
 - Fewer children especially in rural areas
 - The effects of house prices and planning decisions
 - The challenge of recruiting Headteachers
 - Financial pressures and cost effectiveness
 - A rigorous inspection regime and
 - Parental preference
3. The report established the definition of a small primary school in Wiltshire as one with less than 70 pupils on roll. The report also responded to the national expectation that the Local Authority would proactively remove surplus places. The key outcome of the report requested that governing bodies with less than 70 pupils on roll consider options for their future, including the potential for structural change. A programme was put in place to support the federation of small schools. Follow up reports have subsequently been presented to the Children Services Select Committee in 2006, 2008 and 2009 highlighting the changes in national and local context and the progress in reducing the number of small schools.

4. The 2006 report identified 33 primary schools as having less than 70 pupils on roll. By 2008 this figure had reduced to 22 and in January 2011 the school census identified that Wiltshire now has 17 schools with fewer than 70 pupils on roll. It is also important to note that of the 17 schools with less than 70 pupils only two schools have less than 35 pupils, one of which is currently consulting on closure (Grafton Church of England Primary School) and the other supports transient service families (Lypiatt Primary School). A key aspect of our support is facilitating schools to work together. Of the current 17 schools below 70 pupils on roll 4 schools are already involved in some form of partnership or federated arrangement while others are more actively exploring how they will work with other schools to ensure effective provision for their pupils and communities.
5. In summary, since 2003, 32 schools have amalgamated (in 2 cases 3 schools were involved in the amalgamation) to establish 15 new schools, many of which were designated small schools under the Wiltshire definition. Nine schools have closed; with size as a key factor in their closure. Four pairs of schools have established either a form of federation or collaborative partnership. While not all of these structural changes have been driven by size, the arrangements are supporting increased effectiveness.
6. A review of projected pupil numbers suggests there is potential for a further 7 primary schools whose number on roll may fall below 70 in the coming years. They are geographically spread across Wiltshire. A number of these schools are already working in partnerships to support both their provision and efficiency. There is support available for these schools and we are planning to develop this support further through our focus in developing school-to-school support in the practitioner-led climate. For one school structural change is planned as the school is being relocated and rebuilt in order that it will be closer to new housing.

Main Considerations for the Council

7. The 2009 report to Children Services Select Committee on the development of the small school strategy identified a number of key drivers which included:
 - The Regional Spatial Strategy and its impact on shaping local housing growth and therefore the need to plan school places;
 - The need to effectively manage surplus places as part of the central government policies under either the 'Every Child Matters Primary Capital Programme – Primary Strategy for Change' or the 'Building Schools for the Future – Secondary Capital Programme';
 - The national presumption against the closure of rural small schools;

- National Curriculum Reviews and the development in both primary and secondary of particular provision with the curriculum, including Vocational Diploma development 14-19;
 - The implications of the 21st Century Schools White Paper, including reinforcing the new models of leadership and governance (including Accredited School Groups, federation, amalgamations, Trusts and 'Traditional' Academies);
 - The need to lead and manage within a changing financial environment, with an increasing number of national funding reviews which were exploring new funding models.
8. An outcome of the report was to establish a development group to consider the impact of the key drivers outlined in paragraph 7. Within a matter of weeks of the report being published the agenda began to change and this was reported to the Committee in June 2010 as part of the paper sharing the Primary School Strategy. With the introduction of the new Coalition Government's agenda many of the drivers for change in paragraph 7 were either suspended or adapted as new policies have begun to emerge, including the development of 'Converter' Academies or Academy groups and partnerships and Free Schools. There is also less emphasis now on the removal of surplus places by the Local Authority. As a consequence of these changes the establishment of a working group was delayed in order that both the national and local drivers for further change can be understood.
9. Work has continued to support small schools. Advice and guidance has been made available to support both individual and small groups of schools as they review their own or collective situation. Through the Academy Board a development project has been exploring how the schools (primary and secondary) in the Marlborough area can work together to secure both improved outcomes for children and young people and improve cost effectiveness in the future. This work has provided a structure through which the schools in the area, including a number of small schools, can explore future options. In the West and North Wiltshire areas a group of primary schools are developing different models for business support; this group includes smaller schools and is helping them to improve financial efficiency. The Collaborative Partnerships, established through the extended services agenda have ensured that schools can access services and support which as individual schools may not have been available. This has been particularly beneficial to pupils, parents and staff in smaller schools.
10. The recent Governors and Headteachers conference (02.03.11) built on the 2009 conference, which explored different school leadership models, by sharing a range of practical tools and strategies for understanding and securing improved efficiency and effectiveness. As an outcome of the conference groups of

governors and Headteachers of schools (including those both above and below 70 pupils) acknowledge the need to work together to explore different ways of working. Expansion and development of locally available leadership programmes is planned and this support, alongside other developments will underpin the way in which groups of schools can work together, to secure a local self-improving practitioner-led school system.

11. The launch and application process of the Teaching Schools programme in late March 2011 reinforced the national move toward a new self-improving school system. The Teaching School model is based on a group or alliance of schools working together with a range of partners including Universities to support Initial Teacher Training, Continuous Professional Development and wider aspects of school development. Three schools have submitted applications in partnership with others. Within each of the applications, reference is made to improving outcomes for all the children in their area, the outcome of the applications is not yet known.
12. Schools Forum have been leading and managing the budgetary changes affecting schools. This reflects national funding changes and the impact of local policy and priorities, such as the increase in delegation of funding for special educational needs. There have been no specific changes to the arrangements associated with small schools, although the impact of changes on small schools is considered in each case. As part of the budget setting process a decision has been taken to change the current arrangements for devolved formula capital for federated / amalgamated spilt-sites. From 2011-12, schools who amalgamate will only receive the devolved formula capital for both sites for a further year following federation/amalgamation, this reflects the way in which the Department for Education funds the local authority for devolved formula capital. Further budgetary changes which may affect small schools, including national formula changes, are not yet known and are likely to become clearer for the 2012 planning.
13. The Education White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* sets out a clear role for the Local Authority as a champion for educational excellence, vulnerable pupils and parents and families. Within the champion role, the Local Authority also retains a range of statutory duties and responsibilities including continuing to secure sufficient high quality places for pupils. As the Wiltshire Core Strategy for future housing needs becomes clearer, alongside the other national policy and developmental changes, it will be important to support and manage change effectively. Our approach to school-to-school support will manage this change process.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

14. There is no specific environmental impact within this report. However any future strategy developments in relation to small schools would need to be considered carefully assessing and then managing the environmental impact.

Risk Assessment

15. Any future development of a national funding formula for schools could adversely impact on small schools. Changes to the current funding arrangements are being managed locally by Schools Forum, while individual schools are working to improve their cost effectiveness through a range of developments including increased collaborative working.

Financial Implications

16. There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report. However the financial implications of future national and local developments will need to be considered carefully.

Legal Implications

17. There is currently good involvement from the legal department in relation to schools converting to academies. As groups of schools increasingly work together to support the needs of their pupils and wider community, legal advice will be sought on governance arrangements.

Conclusion

18. Since 2005 our strategic approach to addressing the issues faced by small schools has enabled us to move forward in a planned and open way. The existing partnership arrangements across schools is having an impact in both securing improved outcomes for children and young people and improving the efficiency of provision. This work is being extended under the practitioner-led self improving school system. This approach to collaborative working will support all schools, particularly the smaller ones to secure high quality outcomes for children and young people.

Proposal

19. That Children's Services Select Committee notes the content of this paper.

Carolyn Godfrey, Corporate Director Department for Children and Education

Report Authors: Julie Cathcart, Head of School Improvement, tel: 01225 713861 and Nick Glass, Manager for School Strategic Planning, tel: 01225 713853

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report: None

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee
9th June 2011

Consultation on School Funding Reform

Purpose of Report

1. To bring to the attention of the Committee the two consultations published by the Department for Education (DfE) and to summarise Wiltshire's response.

Background

2. In the White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* the Government set out its view that the current school funding system is opaque, full of anomalies and unfair and therefore in need of reform. The White Paper signalled the Government's intention to consult on the merits of moving towards a national funding formula which ensures clear, transparent and fairer funding for all schools, including Academies and Free Schools, based on the needs of pupils.
3. Following this the DfE has published two consultation documents:
 - *A consultation on school funding reform: Rationale and Principles*
 - *Academies pre-16 funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year*
4. Both of these documents have been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Main Considerations for the Council

5. The closing date for both consultations was 25th May 2011 and Wiltshire's responses are attached as Appendices 1 and 2 to this report. In each case the response is a joint response from the Council and Schools Forum and it should be noted that the views of Schools Forum include the views of head teachers from both maintained schools and academies in Wiltshire.

A Consultation on School Funding Reform: Rationale and Principles

6. This represents the first stage in the consultation on funding reform and invites views on the aims and objectives of a school funding system and high level principles for any reform. It is expected that a more detailed consultation will be published in the summer to look at the operation of any national formula.
7. The document outlines the key difficulties with the current funding system which are:
 - It is opaque and extremely complex
 - It is unfair as it leads to schools with similar intakes receiving very difficult levels of funding
 - It fails to reflect need accurately
 - It does not support the new school system
8. Wiltshire would agree with all of these points. The table included in response to question 3 (Appendix 1) illustrates the differences in per pupil funding received under the current funding regime in Wiltshire compared with its neighbouring authorities. These differences are historical and without a needs led formula can no longer be explained.
9. The consultation document then goes on to consider the idea of a national fair funding formula for schools and to seek views on the degree of local flexibility that should be allowed within such a formula.
10. A key issue for Wiltshire is that any formula needs to reflect issues associated with rurality. For Wiltshire schools this may mean reflecting the existence of pockets of deprivation within villages, the number of small schools and the potential for federated and amalgamated schools operating from more than one site. Our current local formula also recognises the difficulties for service schools of high levels of turbulence in pupil numbers. For this reason the response notes that we would support a degree of local flexibility. In order to ensure that academies, free schools and maintained schools are funded on an equal footing, which is a stated objective of the consultation, the response stresses that per pupil funding coming in to Wiltshire for each type of school should be the same under any national formula even if local authorities then have a degree of flexibility in the formula for maintained schools.
11. The consultation also highlights issues relating to the funding of high cost pupils with special educational needs or who are disabled. It should be noted that the consultation questions are the same as those included in the DfE consultation document *Support and aspiration: a new approach to*

special needs and disability. The proposals explore the idea of a national banded funding framework to ensure that the descriptors of need are consistent across all areas however it is not proposed that funding values would be ascribed to these bands at a national level, rather that local leaders would have the flexibility to meet the needs of disabled young people and in their own area. This indicates that the DfE intends for a degree of local flexibility around special educational needs funding.

12. Finally the document looks at potential timescales for change and the potential level of change that schools could manage. Wiltshire would be keen to move towards a fair funding mechanism that better reflects the relative needs of pupils in the county. In the response we have identified that the work should begin in 2012/13 for implementation in 2013/14.

Academies Pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year

13. This document looks specifically at the model for funding academies in the 2012/13 financial year, reflecting the DfE view that the current model is unsustainable and will need to be changed for the 2012/13 year regardless of whether a national fair funding formula is in place. Within the document the following difficulties with the current academies funding model are identified:

- The process is not transparent
- It does not quickly reflect local circumstances
- There is a risk of error in the process of replicating local authority formulae
- The process becomes more difficult with the increasing number of academies
- It is not sustainable
- It is not administratively efficient

14. Again, Wiltshire would agree with all of the difficulties highlighted. Academies are funded on a lagged basis in which the local authority formula for the previous financial year is replicated by the DfE and updated for September pupil numbers. This is administratively burdensome as the DfE needs staff to replicate and understand the funding formula for each local authority whilst Councils also need to calculate a budget for each academy in order to inform the DfE on the amount to recoup from the Dedicated Schools Grant each year.
15. The document proposes 3 potential funding systems for academies in 2012/13:

- **Roll forward** – this is the DfE’s preferred option and would result in the per pupil funding received by each school in the current year being rolled forward in to 2012/13, with budgets being updated for pupil numbers. It is argued that this is the simplest method however it results in the funding for academies being even less reflective of local circumstances as it would still be based on per pupil funding in the 2010/11 local authority formula.
- **A fair funding formula for academies only** – this could give an opportunity to trial a fair funding formula however would result in academy funding moving away from comparable maintained schools in the same area.
- **Local Authority based calculations** – this would require local authorities to calculate budgets using the formulae they already hold. Wiltshire has responded that this would be our preferred approach as it is administratively more straightforward and these calculations are already being done at local authority level.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

16. None identified.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

17. A core principle of the two consultation documents is that pupils should be funded according to need and that differences in funding between comparable schools should be minimized. It is also a stated principle that different types of schools ie, maintained schools, academies and free schools should be funded on an equal footing.

Risk Assessment

18. No specific risks are identified arising from the responses to these initial consultation documents. The implications of the detailed changes in the phase 2 consultation document will require detailed analysis to establish the impact on funding for schools and support services in Wiltshire.

Financial Implications

19. This report outlines the response to consultations on school funding reform. At present only the rationale and principles are explored and it is expected that financial implications will be clearer once the DfE finalises the proposals for the next stage of the consultation. The financial implications of any changes to the school funding regime will impact on all schools in Wiltshire and on funding for support services currently funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Legal Implications

20. None identified.

Proposal

21. Members are asked to note the responses to the consultations on schools funding reform.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report Author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)
Elizabeth.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk , 01225 713675

Date of report: 27 May 2011

Background Papers

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – A consultation on schools funding reform: rationale and principles.
Response from Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire Schools Forum

Appendix 2 – Academies pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic
Year. Response from Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire Schools Forum

This page is intentionally left blank

A consultation on school funding reform: rationale and principles

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is:

25 May 2011

Your comments must reach us by that date.

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Children, Schools and Families consultation website www.education.gov.uk/consultations

The information you provide in your response will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations, which allow public access to information held by the Department. This does not necessarily mean that your response can be made available to the public as there are exemptions relating to information provided in confidence and information to which the Data Protection Act 1998 applies. You may request confidentiality by ticking the box provided, but you should note that neither this, nor an automatically-generated e-mail confidentiality statement, will necessarily exclude the public right of access.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Name Elizabeth Williams

Organisation (if applicable) Wiltshire Council & Wiltshire Schools Forum

Address: Wiltshire Council
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
BA14 8JB

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either

Juliet Yates on: Telephone: 020 7340 8313 e-mail: juliet.yates@education.gsi.gov.uk,
or

Ian McVicar on: Telephone: 020 7340 7980 e-mail: ian.mcvicar@education.gsi.gov.uk

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Consultation Unit by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk, by Fax: 01928 794 311, or by telephone: 0870 000 2288.

Appendix 1

Please tick the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> School	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Trade Union / Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Early Years Setting
<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent / Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

If 'Other' Please Specify:

This is a joint response between the LA and Schools Forum in Wiltshire

1. Do you agree with the stated characteristics of an ideal school funding system? (Section 2)

X All Some None Not Sure

Comments:

A school funding system should have the characteristics outlined in the document, ie.,

- Distribute money in a fair and logical way
- Distribute extra resources to the pupils who need them most
- Be transparent and easy to understand and explain
- Support a diverse range of school provision on a level playing field
- Provide value for money and ensure proper use of public funds

The funding system should be able to ensure that funds are directed to need but it is more difficult for the system itself to ensure that all funds are spent appropriately.

It is important that the methodology used to determine that resources are directed towards need are understood to be fair so that relative differences between LA areas and schools can be understood.

2. Are there further characteristics the system should have? (Section 2)

X Yes No Not Sure

If 'Yes', what are they?

Previous funding systems have included stability and predictability as aims, these are not stated here.

Some recognition of local needs for example, rurality, for example small schools and different types of federation and amalgamations with split sites, and service schools, specifically needs not reflected in the pupil premium for service pupils, for example the fluctuations in pupil numbers within this type of school.

3. Do you agree with the analysis of how the current system falls short of these aims? (Section 3)

X Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

We would agree that the current system, at a high level, has the flaws identified in the document, ie.,

- It is opaque and complex
- It is unfair as comparable schools in different parts of the country receive different levels of funding
- It fails to reflect need accurately
- It does not support the new school system

Within these constraints LAs have been able to reflect local need within their formulae however this is within the overall quantum set by the national allocation of funding. This has been the role of Schools Forum in partnership with the local authority.

Under the current system Wiltshire has consistently received lower levels of funding than its neighbouring authorities with little transparency as to how this reflects levels of need. An example of the impact can be seen in the table below which compares the Guaranteed Unit of Funding in Wiltshire compared with neighbouring authorities:

Pupils per DSG Calculator		63895			
Local Authority	GUF 2011-12	Difference	Total increased GUF if Wiltshire funded at the same level	Potential extra funding that a 200 pupil primary school would receive	Potential extra funding that a 1000 pupil secondary school would receive
Wiltshire	4593	0	£0		
Hampshire	4648	55	£3,514,225	£11,000	£55,000
BANES	4788	195	£12,459,525	£39,000	£195,000
Glos	4661	68	£4,344,860	£13,600	£68,000
Swindon	4696	103	£6,581,185	£20,600	£103,000
Dorset	4683	90	£5,750,550	£18,000	£90,000
North Somerset	4677	84	£5,367,180	£16,800	£84,000
Somerset	4668	75	£4,792,125	£15,000	£75,000

4. Do you agree with the case for reforming the system?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

The current system is based on “spend plus” and therefore perpetuates a historical funding position. A formula would be more responsive to the level of need in a particular area. See the analysis in the response to Q3 to indicate the impact of this.

5. Do you agree that the aim of ensuring all deprived pupils get the same level of funding no matter where they live is the right one? (Section 4)

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

The amount of funding for deprivation coming in to a LA area has been difficult to identify and has been based on the position in 2005/06, the position in Wiltshire has changed since then and recent SOA data suggests that levels of deprivation in Wiltshire are increasing. This proposal would ensure that the funding Wiltshire receives for deprived pupils is the same as in other parts of the country.

The allocation of a level of funding for schools based on individual pupils is a mechanism for ensuring that schools are funded for the needs of the pupils in the school at that time. It would be necessary to ensure that funding coming in to the LA also includes an element of deprivation to enable services to reflect need. Currently pupils from deprived areas get the same level of additional funding but the base funding for deprivation is in the overall allocation of DSG to the LA and is not consistent between areas.

Wiltshire Schools Forum would also stress that an appropriate measure of deprivation needs to be used – currently the Wiltshire formula is felt to be more responsive to need through the use of post code data rather than the FSM measure used for the

pupil premium.

6. Do you agree the underlying funding formula needs to change to meet this aim more quickly and effectively?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:
What is meant by the “underlying formula”
There may be transitional issues if funding shifts from a per pupil basis to more funding being allocated on the basis of deprivation.
Wiltshire does not support the use of FSM data as the basis for allocating funds for deprivation.

7. Do you think the school funding system should be based on a purely national formula? Or should there be flexibility for local decisions about funding levels? (Section 5)

Purely National Some local flexibility A lot of local flexibility Not Sure

Comments:

A purely national formula would limit Schools Forum's role in determining the allocation of resources across schools in a LA area.

Para 5.3 suggest a national formula that stated the aggregate level of funding for maintained schools in each authority but allowed LAs to vary the actual budgets for schools to meet local circumstances or locally agreed priorities. The advantage of this proposal is that the national allocation of funding to a LA area could be reformed whilst still allowing LAs and Schools Forums to agree and reflect local priorities. A disadvantage would still be the difficulty in making comparisons between comparable schools in different areas and a potential difference in levels of funding for academies and maintained schools in an area plus the impact of the increasing number of academies in any LA area. If the underlying level of funding per pupil for academies and maintained schools were the same in any LA area then differences between the funding formula for each type of school would have less impact and could be perceived as fair.

8. If so, should that flexibility be limited, and if so how? (Section 5)

Yes

No

X Not Sure

How?

Flexibility is currently limited by the constraints of the overall funding total and by the overarching priorities.

9. If there is local flexibility, what should the roles of local authorities, schools and the Schools Forum be in decision making? (Sections 5 and 6)

Local authorities:

Local authorities will set strategy and priorities in partnership with Schools Forum and other schools within the area

Schools:

Schools will still be responsible for meeting the needs of the pupils on their roll

Schools Forum:

Schools Forum will work in partnership with the local authority to set strategy around funding and to allocate funding for schools in the LA area including academies and free schools

Comments:

10. If there is local flexibility for maintained schools, how should Academies and Free Schools be funded? (Section 5)

Through the fair
funding formula

Taking into account
local decisions

X Not Sure

Comments:

It is a stated aim of the funding system that academies and free schools should be funded on a level playing field so that no type of school is financially advantaged or disadvantaged by the system. In order to achieve that it would be necessary to take in to account the elements of local flexibility in the funding of non maintained state schools.

If the per pupil funding coming in to Wiltshire is the same across all types of school then it would still be possible to have flexibility for maintained schools whilst applying a national fair funding formula to academies and free schools in the area. This could still be perceived as fair. If the level of per pupil funding coming in to the county varies across types of schools then this would create more problems in applying differential formulae.

11. How do you think SEN support services might be funded so that schools, Academies, Free Schools and other education providers have access to high quality SEN support services? (Section 7)

Comments:

A core level of service should be provided by the local authority. It is more important to define the level and type of service than how it should be funded.

12. How do you think a national banded funding framework for children and young people with SEN or who are disabled could improve the transparency of funding decisions to parents while continuing to allow for local flexibility? (Section 7)

Comments:

A concern might be that if a national framework of descriptors is developed but funding levels are agreed locally parents will not be able to understand the differences between funding levels in different LA areas or between types of schools when they are apparently funding the same level of need.

Should the banding framework include funding for health needs and social care?

13. How can the different funding arrangements for specialist provision for young people pre-16 and post-16 be aligned more effectively to provide a more consistent approach to support for children and young people with SEN or who are disabled from birth to 25? (Section 7)

Comments:

Funding for post 16 pupils in 6th forms needs to be updated from the 2000/01 position on which it is based.

It would be important to consider not just the alignment of pre and post 16 funding but also funding streams for health and social care to reduce the bureaucracy in allocating funding for pupils with complex needs.

14. How successfully has the EYSFF been implemented? How might it be improved? (Section 8)

X Very Fairly A little Not at all Not Sure

Comments:

Wiltshire's EYSFF has been in place since April 2010 and has already been reviewed with some minor changes implemented following consultation.

There is a tension between the complexity of the formula and the principle of fairness – some providers consider that the formula is too complicated but that has to be balanced with the need to reflect a wide range of providers plus other issues including rurality and sustainability.

15. How important is an element of local flexibility in free early education funding? What might alternative approaches look like? (Section 8)

Very Fairly A little Not at all Not Sure

Comments:

The national rate included within the funding for 2 year olds is well understood by providers. This suggests that it would be possible to implement a national formula for 3 and 4 year olds but some element of local flexibility would be required, eg for rural settings.

A national formula that included rates for 3 different providers – maintained nurseries, PVI settings and childminders – could be combined with a smaller degree of local flexibility.

The question of how to meet the needs of high cost pupils within the EYSFF has not been answered in Wiltshire with funding being allocated to settings outside of the main formula. Would it be possible to include Early Years in the national banding framework?

16. How should we identify the total amount of funding for early years and free early education for three year olds and four year olds not in reception from within the overall amount of 3-16 funding? (Section 8)

Comments:

If there is a formulaic approach to schools then a similar approach could be taken for the funding of the free entitlement in early years settings. There is overlap with maintained nurseries so a consistent approach may be easier to understand and explain.

17. Should the formula include only pupil led factors or also school led factors? (Section 9)

Only pupil-led factors

Include school-led factors

Not Sure

Comments:

Include school led factors

The Wiltshire formula currently includes site specific factors, for example the split site allowance, small school curriculum protection and a service schools factor which reflects the additional challenges from turbulence in pupil numbers. The Wiltshire formula also recognises significant in year increases in pupil numbers.

18. What factors should be included? (Section 9)

Comments:

Any funding formula should take in to account rurality and associated issues such as small schools and split site schools (arising from federations and amalgamations).

19. What is the right balance between simplicity and complexity? (Section 9)

Comments:

The current spend plus system of funding is simple however it is not perceived as fair or transparent.

There needs to be enough complexity to enable the formula to be responsive to the relative differences in need between areas

20. What level of change in budgets per year can schools manage? (Section 10)

Comments:

It is difficult to specify a level without considering transition periods. It is also dependent on the degree of predictability associated with the change and also stability in not having significant swings in funding from year to year.

21. How much time do schools need to plan for changes in their funding? (Section 10)

3 months 3 – 6 months 6 – 12 months More than 1 year Not Sure

Comments:

**22. When is the right time to start moving towards a fair funding formula?
(Section 10)**

X	2012 – 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	2013 – 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	2014 – 15	<input type="checkbox"/>	2015 – 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Sure
---	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	-------------

Comments:

It would be important to start moving towards a fair funding formula in 2012/13 for implementation in 2013/14

23. Have you any further comments?

Comments:

A key issue for Wiltshire is the recognition of the needs of pupils in rural areas and the additional costs of providing services for example small village schools.

Wiltshire is keen to move towards a fair funding formula and away from a historical method of funding as differences between funding for schools in Wiltshire and neighbouring authorities cannot be understood.

The views from the Wiltshire Schools Forum in this response reflect the views of both academies and maintained schools in Wiltshire.

Appendix 1

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 794304 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 25 May 2011

Send by e-mail to: schoolfunding.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

Send by post to:

Ian McVicar
Funding Policy and Efficiency Team
4th Floor
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT

Academies Pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is: 25 May
2011

Your comments must reach us by that date.

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Education e-consultation website (<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>).

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Reason for confidentiality:

Name Elizabeth Williams
Organisation (if applicable) Wiltshire Schools Forum
Address: c/o Wiltshire Council
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire BA14 8JB

Appendix 2

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either:

Annie Raw (telephone: 020 7340 8143) or Victoria Ismail (telephone: 020 7783 8682)

e-mail: AcademiesFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

If you have a query relating to the consultation process you can contact the Consultation Unit by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Appendix 2

Please mark ONE box that best describes you as a respondent

<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input type="checkbox"/> School applying for academy status	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained School
<input type="checkbox"/> Academy Sponsor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Union/Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

Please Specify:

Appendix 2

1 Do you agree with our analysis that the current system is not appropriate to fund an increasing number of Academies in a fair and transparent way? (see section 2 in the consultation document)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

The current system is administratively inefficient for both the DfE and for LA staff and there is considerable duplication.

The funding of Academies on a lagged basis means that the budget for an academy may not be reflective of local conditions and of the local funding formula, meaning academies are not funded on a consistent basis with neighbouring schools – this may be to their advantage or disadvantage.

The current funding system is not sustainable as LACSEG adjustments will be on an ever decreasing base.

2 Do you agree with the principles for an alternative method of funding Academies in 2012/13? (see section 3 in the consultation document)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All	<input type="checkbox"/> Some	<input type="checkbox"/> None
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure		

Comments:

Appendix 2

3 Are there other aims we should have for the Academy funding system in the absence of cross-system reform, such as a Fair Funding Formula? If yes, what are they?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Savings and efficiencies could be achieved through reducing the administrative burden of the funding system. This could go as far as requiring LAs to calculate budgets for academies, which would reduce the need for replication of the formula at DfE level and reduce the lag in reflecting local circumstances.

4 Do you agree with the broad analysis of how each option might work? (see section 4 in the consultation document)

All

Some

None

Not Sure

Comments:

Roll Forward – this method rolls forward the per pupil school budget share from the previous year's budgets, prior to MFG application. The benefit of this method is that it is simple and easy to explain. It also minimises turbulence in budgets for academies which is important in an interim funding regime. A potential disadvantage is that academy funding becomes further removed from that of maintained schools in the same area because it will still be based on the 2010/11 formula, meaning that funding is not equivalent between all types of schools.

Fair Funding Formula for Academies – a single formula would be developed for academies. This would mean academies are funded in a consistent way and is a potential way of trialling a fair funding formula. A risk may be that the current number of academies may not reflect the overall school population in terms of numbers and needs – for example there are significantly more

Appendix 2

secondary academies than primary academies. An extensive consultation would still be required with all schools to develop a fair funding formula for all schools – which may cause further turbulence for academies with successive changes in funding regime.

Local Authority Based Calculations - this would involve LAs calculating academy budgets based on their current formulae. The advantage of this option would be to remove the lagging from the current system and reduce the bureaucracy of needing to replicate LA formulae at DfE level. There is little implication for LAs in this option as authorities already calculate budgets for academies in order to determine the recoupment amount from the DSG settlement. It could be argued that this option would result in academies being more reliant on the LA and its formula although a counter argument to this could be that it creates a level playing field between schools in an area and could reflect local circumstances more consistently.

We disagree that this would mean academies would receive later notification of their funding than they currently do, because in practice converting academies have not yet received notification of indicative budgets for 2011/12.

5 Which option do you think is the best way of funding Academies in 2012/13? (see section 4 in the consultation document)

<input type="checkbox"/> Roll forward	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair funding formula for Academies only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local authority based calculations
<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure		

Comments:

LAs already carry out the calculation and this would be the method with the least administrative burden.

6 Are there potential advantages and disadvantages in implementing each option that we have not considered? If yes, what are they?

Appendix 2

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

Increase in lag to academy budgets if the roll forward option is implemented could mean more turbulence when a fair funding formula is implemented across all sectors.

7 Are there changes you think we should consider to the way the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) is calculated for FY2012/13? If yes, what are they? (see section 5 in the consultation document)

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

The current LACSEG methodology does not reflect the need or usage of a particular service.

The LA funded element of the LACSEG has already been taken in to account in the 2012/13 funding settlement and so could not be changed.

Would a straight % deduction be a more straightforward method of calculating the LACSEG?

8 What factors would you want us to take into consideration if we were to make changes?

Appendix 2

Comments:

Keep the interim model simple and ensure a quick move towards a national formula

9 Have you any further comments?

Comments:

The views from the Wiltshire Schools Forum in this response reflect the views of both academies and maintained schools in Wiltshire.

This response also reflects the views of Wiltshire Council and is a joint response.

Appendix 2

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

Appendix 2

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 738212 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 25 May 2011

Send by post to: Annie Raw, Academy Funding and Finance Team, Department for Education, Level 3, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT.

Send by e-mail to: AcademiesFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee 9th June 2011

Scrutiny of Procurement and Commissioning

Purpose

1. To agree a revised approach to scrutiny of procurement and commissioning following decision by the Overview and Scrutiny (OS) Liaison Board.

Background

2. The Council is changing its approach to how it procures and commissions goods and services in order to achieve significant efficiencies and savings. This is an important component of the Council's Business Plan. A Corporate Commissioning and Procurement Board has been established under the chairmanship of the Director of Resources which oversees the delivery of a 4 year programme.
3. Previously each of the OS select committees had a task group scrutinising performance of major contracts relevant to its service area. A review of the costs and future direction of these major contracts is included within the new programme.
4. The Organisation and Resources Select Committee has received presentations on the programme's content. It also considered a report back in November last year providing an opportunity to review the way that OS might best respond to the development of the programme ensuring effective use of councillors time and the scrutiny support resources. Further work was called for in order to take forward the views of the Committee.
5. On 10th February, the OS Liaison Board considered a report on the further work called for by the Select Committee on how scrutiny might best respond to this changing landscape. The Service Director for Legal and Democratic Services and the Head of Democratic Services attended to report on recent service efficiencies which would have a bearing on the Scrutiny Team's ability to provide comprehensive and effective support in all areas. Councillors were asked to be mindful of this and their intention to focus future work on the priorities outlined in the Business Plan in making a decision.

Revised Arrangements

6. The Board agreed the proposals in the report, which in summary abolishes the existing major contracts task groups and creates a single task group under the Organisation & Resources Select Committee to scrutinise the delivery of the overall procurement and commissioning programme on a quarterly basis. Specific reporting on the performance of major contracts would continue by exception. The proposed terms of reference for the Task Group are:
- i) Implementation of the Corporate Procurement Strategy
 - ii) Implementation of the Procurement and Commissioning Programme
 - iii) Progress on making efficiency savings
 - iv) Development of policies and supporting documents
 - v) Review of performance of individual major contracts by exception
 - vi) Referral of departmental specific procurement and commissioning issues to the relevant select committee where appropriate.
7. It was further agreed that in order to provide continuity of knowledge and a link back to the individual select committees, membership of the new task group should consist of one representative from each of the previous major contracts task groups. In addition it was also proposed that Cllr Tony Deane and Cllr Nigel Carter, who have led on a number of related activities including scrutiny of the Corporate Procurement Strategy, should be included in the membership.
8. The membership of this Select Committee's current Major Contracts Task Group is Councillors Bill Moss (Chairman), Peter Colmer, Jon Hubbard, Jacqui Lay and Carole Soden. Membership and current actives of all the existing major contracts task groups is attached for information.
9. The other three select committees have now approved the proposal and the following members have been appointed to the new Procurement & Commissioning Task Group:
- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Organisation & Resources | Cllr Tony Deane
Cllr Nigel Carter
Cllr Mark Packard |
| Health & Adult Social Care | Cllr Peter Hutton |
| Environment | Cllr Peter Doyle |

Conclusion

10. The rationale to change the current scrutiny arrangements in this area is driven by the need for a more focussed and professional approach to future commissioning and procurement. This is intended to secure efficiencies and savings in the overall spend for the authority. The agreed approach by the OS Liaison Board presents the opportunity to continue to scrutinise this priority area effectively, recognising the capacity and resources available.
11. With this in mind the Liaison Board resolved that future scrutiny of procurement and commissioning would be dealt with by way of one dedicated Procurement and Commissioning Task Group which would report directly to the Organisation & Resources Select Committee. The focus of work would move away from individual contract reviews to the overall procurement and commissioning programme as a component of the Business Plan. Membership is intended to provide for continuity and to retain knowledge gained under the previous arrangements.

Recommendation:

- 1. To note the considerations given to this issue by the Overview and Scrutiny Liaison Board;**
- 2. To agree to the disbandment of the Select Committee's current Major Contracts Task Group;**
- 3. To approve the new task group arrangements for scrutinising the procurement and commissioning programme under the Organisation & Resources Select Committee; and**
- 4. To nominate a member to join the new 'Procurement and Commissioning Scrutiny Task Group' in addition to the Councillors already appointed.**

Paul Kelly

Overview and Scrutiny Manager (and Designated Scrutiny Officer)

Contact details: 01225 713049

paul.kelly@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Current Arrangements for Scrutiny of Contracts and Procurement

Service Area	Process	Membership	Activity
Overview and Scrutiny Organisation and Resources Select Committee	Major Contracts Task Group	Cllr Richard Britton (Chairman) Cllr Nigel Carter Cllr Judy Rook Cllr Roy While Cllr Helen Osborn Cllr Ricky Rogers	Monkton Park Facilities Management Contract
			Energy
			Sodexo (Building Cleaning Services, Grounds Maintenance Services, County Hall Facilities Management)
	Corporate Procurement Strategy Rapid Scrutiny Exercises	Cllr Tony Deane Cllr Nigel Carter	Logica
Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee	Major Contracts Task Group	Cllr Peter Hutton (Chairman) Cllr Tom James Cllr Peter Hutton Cllr Nina Phillips Cllr Peter Davis Dr Peter Biggs (Stakeholder)	Order of St John Care Trust
			Medequip Assistive Technologies
			Tendering of the Equipment for Daily Living and Minor Adaptations contract
Children's Services Select Committee	Major Contracts Task Group	Cllr Bill Moss (Chairman) Cllr Carole Soden Cllr Jon Hubbard Cllr Jacqui Lay Cllr Peter Colmer	Quarriers
			Sodexo (School Catering)
			Sure Start Children's Centres
			White Horse Education Partnership
Environment Select Committee	Major Contracts Task Group	Cllr Peter Doyle (Chairman) Cllr Tom James Cllr Nigel Carter Cllr Peter Colmer Cllr Mark Packard	Mouchel and Ringway
			Hills Waste
			Retendering of the Salisbury and Amesbury Area Bus Contracts
			DC Leisure (although this was cancelled in light of the wider leisure review)

Wiltshire Council

Children's Services Select Committee
9th June 2011

Task Group updates

1. Further Education in the Salisbury Area Task Group

Membership: Cllr Mary Douglas
Cllr Jon Hubbard
Cllr Bill Moss
Cllr Jacqui Lay
Dr Mike Thompson (Chairman)

The Task Group held their third meeting on 24th May 2011. Members received data showing the post-16 destinations of Salisbury year 11 students in 2010, enabling a comparison with the same data for 2009, received at the previous meeting. The data showed a general decrease in those taking A-levels, and increase in those taking Level 3 courses, but no significant shift in the percentages of those going out or staying in county for post-16 study (36% and 64% respectively (2010)).

Members also received briefings on:

- Levels of transport provided by out-of-county post-16 providers for Salisbury-based students;
- Numbers of in-county post-16 placements funded in 2010 and how the number of places is calculated using a 'lagged learner' approach;
- Post-16 destinations of leavers from individual Salisbury secondary schools;
- The influence of pupil performance on post-16 destination choice;
- The influence of whether the secondary school has post-16 provision on pupils' post-16 destinations;
- Which Salisbury secondary schools are considering academisation
- The likely impact of proposed housing developments in the Salisbury area on future post-16 demand.

The Task Group's next meeting will be held at St Joseph's Catholic School, Laverstock on 10th June. Members will meet students, headteachers and governors from all three Laverstock schools to discuss their views on post-16 provision in the Salisbury area.

2. Major Contracts Task Group

Membership: Cllr Peter Colmer
Cllr Jon Hubbard
Cllr Jacqui Lay
Cllr Bill Moss (Chairman)
Cllr Carole Soden

The Task Group has not met since the Committee's previous meeting. There is a proposal to disband this task group elsewhere on this agenda (see *Scrutiny of Procurement and Commissioning*).

3. Placements for Looked After Children (LAC) Task Group

Membership: Cllr Peter Colmer
Cllr Andrew Davis
Cllr Jon Hubbard (Chairman)
Rev Alice Kemp
Cllr Bill Moss
Cllr Helen Osborn

This Task Group was scheduled to meet on 7th June but due to a clash with Corporate Parenting Panel will now be rescheduled.

4. Special School and Post-16 SEN Task Group

Membership: Cllr Carole Soden
Rev Alice Kemp
Cllr Graham Payne
Cllr Anthony Trotman

This Task Group held their initial scoping meeting on 12th May and were joined by Mark Brotherton, Head of Targeted School & Learner Support, Karina Kulawik, Manager for Inclusion and Tina Pagett, Senior 13-19 Advisor.

Members received briefings on

- the current designations, capacities and Ofsted ratings of each of Wiltshire's six special schools;
- the potential impact of special schools becoming academies;
- the national policy direction in terms of special educational needs.

For their next meeting, members requested a report providing an outline of post-16 SEN issues, including what facilities Wiltshire has, what are the funding arrangements, plans for the future etc.

5. Rapid Scrutiny Exercise: Green Paper – Children & Young People with SEN and Disabilities

Membership (TBC): Cllr Paul Darby
Cllr Jon Hubbard
Rev Alice Kemp
Cllr Jacqui Lay
Cllr Helen Osborn
Cllr Carole Soden

In September, the Committee agreed to undertake a rapid scrutiny exercise to respond to the Government's Green Paper on Children & Young People with SEN and Disabilities.

However, on 20th May, Cllr Jane Scott and Carolyn Godfrey hosted a workshop to co-ordinate a Wiltshire response to the Green Paper, including councillors, officers and representatives from the health service as well as parent groups. The event was also attended by Cllr Hubbard, Cllr Lay and Rev Alice Kemp from the Select Committee. Attendees split into small groups, each taking a portion of the 59 broad-ranging consultation questions, before feeding suggested responses back to the group. Officers from DCE are now compiling the results and a draft response will be circulated amongst attendees for comment prior to submission to the Department for Education (DfE). **This draft response will be circulated to members of the rapid scrutiny group. Members may wish to decide if, given the event above and the size of the consultation, whether members still wish to meet and form the Committee's own response to the Green paper. The deadline for response is 30th June.**

Paul Kelly – Designated Scrutiny Officer and Scrutiny Manager

Report author: Henry Powell, 01225 718052, henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Item and Meeting Date	Purpose of Report	Consultation	Supporting Documents	Responsible Cabinet Member	Officer Contact	Wiltshire Council Business Plan 2011-15 reference
22nd July 2011						
Coalition Changes - Update from Department for Children and Education	A standing item detailing recent changes made by the Coalition Government.	-	-	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Lynda Cox lynda.cox@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 07500 605299	Summary of Legislative Change (Page 11)
Budget & Performance Monitoring	A standing item reporting the latest budget and performance monitoring information for the Department of Children & Education.	-	-		Henry Powell henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 01225 718052	
Reducing Child Poverty	This report will go to Cabinet on 26 July – to agree the strategy.	Jan 2011–April 2011 National strategy also being developed in similar timescale – final document due to be published by April 2011.	Child Poverty Needs assessment: www.wiltshire.gov.uk/healthandsocialcare/childrenyoungpeoplefamilies/reducingchildpovertyconsultation.htm	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Lynda Cox lynda.cox@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 07500 605299	

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Item and Meeting Date	Purpose of Report	Consultation	Supporting Documents	Responsible Cabinet Member	Officer Contact	Wiltshire Council Business Plan 2011-15 reference
<p>Denominational Home to School Transport</p> <p>TBC</p>	<p>This report will go to Cabinet on 26 July – to seek approval for a change to the Council's Education Transport Policy, withdrawing denominational transport assistance with effect from September 2012.</p>	<p>Letters being sent to affected schools, parents and the Diocese giving the opportunity to comment on the proposal.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Cllr Dick Tonge richard.tonge@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Ian White ian.white@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	
<p>22nd September 2011</p>						
<p>Coalition Changes - Update from Department for Children and Education</p>	<p>A standing item detailing recent changes made by the Coalition Government.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Lynda Cox lynda.cox@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 07500 605299</p>	<p>Summary of Legislative Change (Page 11)</p>
<p>Budget & Performance Monitoring</p>	<p>A standing item reporting the latest budget and performance monitoring information for the Department of Children & Education.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>		<p>Henry Powell henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 01225 718052</p>	

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Item and Meeting Date	Purpose of Report	Consultation	Supporting Documents	Responsible Cabinet Member	Officer Contact	Wiltshire Council Business Plan 2011-15 reference
13-19 Commissioning Strategy	This report will go to Cabinet on 13 September – to approve the 13-19 Commissioning Strategy which will include proposals for future organisation of youth services and for making £600,000 savings noted in the financial plan.	A draft strategy is being issued early in April 2011. This will allow for consultation on the strategy and proposals for youth services prior to recommendations being made to Cabinet.	None.	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Julia Cramp julia.cramp@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 01225 718221	
24th November 2011						
Coalition Changes - Update from Department for Children and Education	A standing item detailing recent changes made by the Coalition Government.	-	-	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Lynda Cox lynda.cox@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 07500 605299	Summary of Legislative Change (Page 11)
Budget & Performance Monitoring	A standing item reporting the latest budget and performance monitoring information for the Department of Children & Education.	-	-		Henry Powell henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 01225 718052	

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Item and Meeting Date	Purpose of Report	Consultation	Supporting Documents	Responsible Cabinet Member	Officer Contact	Wiltshire Council Business Plan 2011-15 reference
Looked After Children Commissioning Strategy	This is scheduled to go before Cabinet on 18 th October 2011	(DETAILS NEEDED)	(DETAILS NEEDED)	(DETAILS NEEDED)	(DETAILS NEEDED)	
26th January 2012						
Coalition Changes - Update from Department for Children and Education	A standing item detailing recent changes made by the Coalition Government.	-	-	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Lynda Cox lynda.cox@wiltshire.gov.uk Tel: 07500 605299	Summary of Legislative Change (Page 11)
Pupil Performance figures	Annual report on educational attainment.	-	-	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Stephanie Denovan stephanie.denovan@wiltshire.gov.uk	
Ofsted Children’s Services Rating 2011		-	-	Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE lionel.grundy@wiltshire.gov.uk	Carolyn Godfrey carolyn.godfrey@wiltshire.gov.uk	
15th March 2012						

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Task Groups	Terms of Reference	Next meeting	Chairman	Officer Contact	Business Plan 2011-15 reference
<p>Further Education in the Salisbury Area Task Group</p>	<p>a. To identify the number of young people from the Salisbury area who travel out of county and for long distances to access 16-19 education provision.</p> <p>b. To identify why those young people travelling long distances to access provision do so, the quality of life and employment implications, and the financial and environmental impact.</p> <p>c. To seek young people’s perception of the 16-19 education provision available in the Salisbury area, both in and out of county.</p> <p>d. If a gap is identified in the provision of 16-19 education in Salisbury area, to make constructive, workable recommendations as to how that gap might be filled.</p>	<p>10th June 10.00am</p> <p>St Joseph’s Catholic School, Salisbury</p>	<p>Dr Michael Thompson</p>	<p>Henry Powell</p>	
<p>Major Contracts Task Group</p>	<p>a. to hold contractors to account for the delivery of public services – in relation to those contracts which fall within the remit of the Children’s Services Select Committee</p> <p>b. to carry out mid-year and annual reviews of major contracts</p> <p>c. to investigate areas of poor performance and concerns arising from contract reviews and to make recommendations for improvement as appropriate</p> <p>d. to establish links with the relevant procurement boards so as to ensure appropriate involvement in the build up to contract renewal</p> <p>e. to periodically report into the Children’s Services Select Committee on matters arising from the task group’s activities during the year</p> <p>f. to produce an annual report for the Children’s Services Select Committee on the main findings and recommendations arising from the work of the task group.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Cllr Bill Moss</p>	<p>Senior Scrutiny Officer</p> <p>01225 718052</p> <p>Henry.powell@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Task Groups	Terms of Reference	Next meeting	Chairman	Officer Contact	Business Plan 2011-15 reference
<p>Placements for Looked After Children (LAC) Task Group</p>	<p>a. To monitor and scrutinise the implementation of the Placements for LAC Commissioning Strategy and its impact upon a) outcomes for Wiltshire’s looked after children and their families/carers, and b) the Placements for LAC budget.</p> <p>b. To consider issues that have particular relevance to looked after children, including, but not limited to, accommodation and homelessness, fostering and adoption processes, educational support for looked after children, and support for their parents/carers and families.</p> <p>c. To monitor and scrutinise how the Council addresses the Family Placements Service as a key priority within the Business Plan 2011-15, including the specific objectives listed under this priority.</p> <p>d. To meet four times per year, with meeting dates agreed in advance where possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC July 2011 • 20th Sep 2011 • 6th Dec 2011 	<p>Cllr Jon Hubbard</p>		<p>Business Plan: Protect – Invest – Save (Page 52)</p> <p>Financial Plan: Protecting & safeguarding vulnerable children (Page 13)</p>
<p>Special School and Post-16 SEN Task Group</p>	<p>a. To establish the strengths and weaknesses of current special school and post-16 SEN provision in Wiltshire, taking into account the views of service users, parents and other stakeholder groups;</p> <p>b. To consider examples of best practice in special school and post-16 provision in Wiltshire and other authority areas;</p> <p>c. To make recommendations with respect to how special schools and post-16 SEN provision can be developed to ensure improved outcomes for Wiltshire residents with SEN.</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>Cllr Graham Payne</p>		<p>Business Plan: Invest in: children’s attainment (Page 60)</p> <p>Financial Plan: Investment in children’s attainment (Page 19)</p>

Forward Work Programme – Children’s Services Select Committee

Task Groups	Terms of Reference	Next meeting	Chairman	Officer Contact	Business Plan 2011-15 reference
<p>SEN Green Paper – rapid scrutiny group</p>	<p>To respond to the Government’s Green Paper on SEN, <i>‘Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability’</i>.</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>TBC</p>		<p>Business Plan: Protect – Invest – Save (Page 52)</p> <p>Financial Plan: Protecting & safeguarding vulnerable children (Page 13)</p>

This page is intentionally left blank