

Schools Forum SEN/ Social Deprivation Working Group

Monday 22nd February 2010

Committee Room 8

Present

Liz Williams
Laura Sharp (Minutes)
Katrina Kulawik
Julia Cramp
Trevor Daniels
John Hawkins
Judith Finney
Colin Smith
Hazel Ryan
Sarah O'Donnell

	Agenda Heading	Action
1.	Apologies Avis Ball Phil Beaumont	
2.	Minutes from previous meeting EW drew attention to point 3 on the previous minutes. After a conversation with Paul Senior she was tasked with finding out the specific questions the group would like to address in the briefing. It was decided to ask the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Secondary Behaviour Support and the link with early intervention and special schools.○ The future of YPSS and where it would lie?○ Early intervention particularly in years 5& 6 regarding behaviour support and Special Schools.○ JH would like a document he has read from Paul Senior titled Early Intervention and Prevention to be wider circulated before the briefing.○ View about how Restorative Practice will impact on SEN○ Projected figures on young people whose needs we	

	are unable to provide for in house.	
3.	<p>Audit Commission SEN Tool</p> <p>Hazel Ryan presented an audit commission SEN/AEN tool to the group. The tool is to be rolled out across Wiltshire schools – initially with a pilot group of 5 schools.</p> <p>In working with the tool it has come to light that Wiltshire does not separately identify funding for Additional Educational Needs (AEN). This is a requirement under the Consistent Financial Reporting rules and is also necessary in order to get a complete view of SEN/AEN expenditure in using the tool and in benchmarking with other schools. As a result HR asked the group to agree a definition of AEN funding.</p> <p>HR proposed that from 2010/11 the notional level of funding for AEN would be identified on the funding certificate.</p> <p>It was agreed by the group that funding identified as AEN would comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personalised Learning funding ○ Free School Meals funding ○ Social Deprivation funding ○ Specific standards funds, to be considered on a case by case basis, for example 1:1 Tuition funding ○ Any funding allocated to schools for Looked After Children 	
4.	<p>Special School Funding</p> <p>The timescales for the review of the banding moderation process and the review of band values were discussed.</p> <p>TD outlined to the group that a meeting will be taking place in March/April between TD, KK and PC with the Special School Head Teachers to start the review and consider benchmarking information for the band values.</p> <p>It was agreed that staffing ratios were an appropriate starting point for the band values but that it may be too prescriptive to include those values in the descriptors for the moderation.</p> <p>Proposals from the review to be brought back to the SEN Working Group in June</p>	
5.	SEN Review	

	<p>TD outlined that the consultation on the review of SEN had been issued on 22nd February. The main issues for Schools Forum were highlighted as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Addressing over capacity in the Primary Complex Needs Centres; ○ Addressing funding issues in Speech & Language and ASD centres; ○ Formula issues for funding SEN in mainstream schools <p>CS highlighted that it would be helpful for the SEN Working Group to have early indications of the key issues.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Social Deprivation formula</p> <p>EW presented to the group the 3 different ways of allocating funding for Social Deprivation:</p> <p>Social Deprivation - £320, 000 – distributed based on Free School Meals Targeted Deprivation - £172, 000 – distributed based on post code data but relatively targeted Personalised Learning - £2.5 Million – distributed based on post code data, less targeted distribution</p> <p>EW proposed that we should move towards a single methodology for allocating social deprivation funding. A discussion followed regarding the success measure for deprivation funding – it was agreed that the over arching success measure is a narrowing of the attainment gap between pupils from deprived backgrounds and those from non-deprived backgrounds. The attainment gap in Wiltshire is larger than the national gap – Wiltshire currently ranks 139 out of 150 LAs in terms of this attainment gap.</p> <p>The key principles of how to distribute funding for social deprivation were discussed with views ranging from targeting the funding at areas of “critical mass” and spreading the funding more widely to recognise all pupils from socially deprived postcode areas</p> <p>The agreed actions were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To look at formula factors and methodologies from other local authorities – particularly Wiltshire’s statistical neighbours where the attainment gap is narrower; 2. To focus the review on the two targeted elements of social deprivation allocation and analyse the impact of moving to a post code basis for distribution; 3. To link the review of the formula with the wider piece of 	

	work on Narrowing the Gap being led by Stephanie Denovan	
	4. To bring initial proposals to the group in June	
7.	Date of next meeting to be confirmed	

DRAFT