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Foreword

I am pleased to present the report of the SEND Strategic Review.

This review has been commissioned jointly with Southampton City Council and has provided an opportunity to explore in depth the needs of children and young people with SEND, learning from experience in both cities.

In Portsmouth the review has focused on six key priorities but the report provides a wealth of information on the broader SEND agenda.

The review has been designed to secure the best possible outcomes for children and young people within an affordable overall level of investment. Across the country it is clear that there is acute pressure on the "High Needs Block" element of school funding from which SEND provision beyond that "normally available" in schools is resourced. Portsmouth is no exception to this. If we are to support children in the best way within the constraints of the funding available we need a resolute, creative strategy, implemented in a way which secures effective buy in from all parties.

The recommendations in this report are coherent and appropriate, providing a clear map of actions needed to ensure that future demands can be met in a financially sustainable way.

The review has involved a wide range of stakeholders, including children, young people and their families; schools, colleges; out of city providers; health; social care and the voluntary sector. The findings have received widespread support and agreement.

Working in close collaboration with schools and partner agencies, the review will now enter into an implementation phase as part of the wider Portsmouth SEND Strategy. This implementation phase will continue to need the active engagement and contribution of a wide range of people. To everyone who will be working on this over the next few years - thank you!

Finally I would like to thank the authors for the dedication and skill they have brought to the review. Their clear thinking and constructive facilitation has provided a set of practical proposals through which we can move forward together to address the complex challenge ahead.

Alison Jeffery

Director of Children, Families and Education
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Notes on terminology used in the report

*The Children and Families Act (2014)*

The Children and Families Act aims to ensure that all children, young people and their families are able to access the right support and provision to meet their special educational needs. The Act outlines a new Code of Practice for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

- Statements of SEN and Learning Difficulty Assessments (LDAs) were replaced by Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs)
- EHC Plans provide statutory protection for young people who are in education or training up to the age of 25 instead of ending at 16
- Parents and young people with SEND have the option of a personal budget to buy specialist support when a Plan is issued
- Local Authorities are required to publish a ‘Local Offer’ outlining the support they will normally provide for children with SEN
- School Action/School Action Plus and Individual Education Plans (IEPs) have been replaced by a single category called SEN Support
- Health services and local authorities will be required to jointly commission and plan services for children and young people

*Special educational needs and disability code of practice*

*Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years: Statutory guidance for organisations which work with and support children and young people who have special educational needs or disabilities*

This Code of Practice provides statutory guidance on duties, policies and procedures relating to Part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014 and associated regulations and applies to England. It relates to children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) and disabled children and young people.

*Definitions of learning difficulties and learning disability*

Learning disability and learning difficulties are terms that are commonly used. These two terms are often interchangeable. ‘Learning Disabilities’ are used more by Adult Services and Health colleagues (based on a medical model of disability), whereas ‘Learning Difficulties’ tends to be used by Children/Young People’s Services and Education colleagues (based on a social model of disability).

- a significantly reduced ability to understand new or complex information and to learn new skills;
- a reduced ability to cope independently;
- an impairment that started before adulthood, with a lasting effect on development.

In the SEND Code of Practice they are used interchangeably. Page 13 states:

"A child or young person has SEN if they have a learning difficulty or disability which calls for special educational provision to be made for him or her"

A child of compulsory school age or a young person has a learning difficulty or disability if he or she:

- has a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others of the same age, or
- has a disability which prevents or hinders him or her from making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age in mainstream schools or mainstream post-16 institutions

School Action, School Action Plus and SEN Support

The School Action and School Action Plus categories of the previous Code of Practice have combined to form one category of SEN support.

SEN support in schools 6.44: Where a pupil is identified as having SEN, schools should take action to remove barriers to learning and put effective special educational provision in place. This SEN support should take the form of a four-part cycle through which earlier decisions and actions are revisited, refined and revised with a growing understanding of the pupil’s needs and what supports them in making good progress and securing good outcomes. This is known as the graduated approach. It draws on more detailed approaches, more frequent review and more specialist expertise in successive cycles in order to match interventions to the SEN of children and young people.
**Education, Health and Care Assessments**

Where, despite the setting having taken relevant and purposeful action to identify, assess and meet the SEN of the child or young person, the child or young person has not made expected progress, the school or parents should consider requesting an Education, Health and Care needs assessment. To inform its decision the local authority will expect to see evidence of the action taken by the setting as part of SEN support.

**Primary and secondary need**

The 0-25 SEND Code of Practice (2015) identifies ‘four broad areas of [special educational] need and support’ (see chapter 6 for detailed descriptions):

- Communication and interaction
- Cognition and learning
- Social, emotional and mental health
- Sensory and/or physical needs

These areas allow schools to gain an overview of their pupils' range of needs. The 0-25 SEND Code (2015) emphasises: ‘The purpose of identification is to work out what action the school needs to take, not to fit a pupil into a category. In practice, individual children or young people often have needs that cut across all these areas and their needs may change over time... A detailed assessment of need should ensure that the full range of an individual’s needs is identified, not simply the primary need.’ (Section 6.27)

Although the Government wishes to move away from assumptions about pupils’ needs based upon their difficulty or disability, they still need information about specific categories of need to allow them to predict levels of future resource. This is collected through the statutory ‘School Census’ and is used nationally and locally to identify the presenting range and number of children with certain types of need, changes over time and to predict provision required for the future.

There are 13 specific categories of need which are often referred to as the child's primary need. As some children present with more than one need it is also possible to assign a secondary need. Whilst, for planning purposes, being able to identify a child’s needs in this way is useful, this is dependent upon the child's needs being correctly identified and the appropriate need being recorded.
The census categories of special educational needs include:

- Specific learning difficulties (SpLD)
- Moderate learning difficulty (MLD)
- Severe learning difficulty (SLD)
- Profound and multiple learning difficulty (PMLD)
- Speech, language and communication needs (SLCN)
- Social, emotional and mental health (SEMH)
- Autistic spectrum disorder (ASD)
- Visual impairment (VI)
- Hearing impairment (HI)
- Multisensory impairment (MSI)
- Physical disability (PD)
- ‘SEN support’ but no specialist assessment of type of need (NSA)

Throughout the report the acronym SEND will be used to refer to children and young people with special educational needs and / or disability.
Executive summary

The SEND Strategic Review was jointly commissioned by Portsmouth and Southampton local authorities to review the provision for children and young people aged 0-25 years with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) to ensure future demands can be met which are financially sustainable.

This followed an announcement by the Government in December 2016 which published details of funding for local authorities to carry out a strategic review of SEND provision, including consideration of the continuum of provision available to meet the range of identified need, as well as the sufficiency of provision going forward.

The Review commenced on 5th June 2017 and was concluded at the end of March 2018. It built on the work that had already been undertaken in Portsmouth and Southampton and was underpinned by the SEND Strategies that were already in place in the two cities.

As identified by the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group and with a focus on financial sustainability, the review focused on a number of shared key priorities, namely:

1. Reviewing the use of high cost out of city placements, where provision is not available locally
2. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs, which is currently putting pressure on special school places
3. Reviewing the availability of post-16 provision for students with SEND, including those with a sensory impairment
4. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children and young people with autism/social communication needs and associated sensory processing difficulties and challenging behaviour
5. Reviewing the use of inclusion centres
6. Reviewing the identification of SEND and thresholds for requesting EHCP needs assessments

As a key principle and aim of the Portsmouth SEND Strategy, inclusion and inclusive practice has also been explored due to its importance as part of a graduated response to meeting the needs of children with SEND.

Throughout the review the team engaged widely with all stakeholders involved in SEND within the city to ensure that a breadth of knowledge and opinion was gained to inform the review findings. Meetings were held with young people, parents and carers; Headteachers and SENCOs; staff from PCC Inclusion Directorate, Social
Care, Adult services, Housing, Finance and Information Teams; Health commissioners and providers; and the voluntary sector.

The review involved research and enquiry, benchmarking, data analysis, visits to a range of provisions across the city and to out of city independent special schools.

Working across the two cities allowed the review team to compare and contrast approaches to managing the needs of children with SEND and to share good practice, common issues and ideas for problem solving. Both cities have signed up to continuing to work together, sharing ideas and solutions and potentially commissioning joint provision.

Whilst the review was jointly commissioned and many of the findings were similar, two final reports have been produced for ease of reference and to allow city specific findings and recommendations to be readily presented.

The review team reported to and regularly shared emerging findings from the review with the SEND 0 - 25 Joint Commissioning Group. Presentations were also made to the SEND Board, Schools Forum, SENCO Conference and Inclusion Conference.

The outcomes of the review will be shared with stakeholders and have been incorporated within a refreshed longer term SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Plan.

The key findings of the review are as follows:

- The numbers and complexity of children and young people with SEND is increasing with the potential for a significant increase in costs. The areas of need that warrant particular attention are children and young people with more complex needs, autism especially where there is challenging behaviour and social, emotional and mental health difficulties (SEMH). Action is required now to manage demand to ensure that future needs can be met that is financially sustainable.

- The demand for specialist provision is increasing in some cases over and above need. It is predicted that the numbers of children being considered for specialist provision / special school places could increase by up to 43% by 2022. Without additional funding this will put further pressure on the High Needs Block with funding implications across all SEND provisions.

- There are children and young people making good progress in mainstream schools who have needs that are the same as or in some cases greater than children and young people currently in Special Schools and Inclusion Centres.
It is essential that mainstream schools are well prepared to meet the opportunity and challenge of supporting the needs of the increasing number of pupils with SEND.

- To cope with the increase in need and demand for specialist provision the criteria for the Special Schools has recently been reviewed. Whilst it is anticipated that there will be a need for more specialist provision the demand for places must be closely managed, working collaboratively with parents, to ensure that needs are met appropriately within the range of provisions available. To meet the increase in need it is recommended that:
  - Extra capacity is created through the expansion of Willows to provide nursery, YR and Y1 SEND provision
  - Consideration is given to protecting a number of nursery and KS1 places at Mary Rose school for those children with the most complex needs
  - Mainstreams schools are supported/incentivised to become more inclusive and to take a wider range of pupils with SEND in line with the most inclusive schools within the city. Mainstream schools are encouraged to develop their own provisions to support the growing number of pupils with SEMH and high functioning autism
  - Outreach provision is enhanced to provide greater support to mainstream schools - to include the development of a peripatetic service to support pupils with speech, language and communication needs and sensory needs related to autism especially at secondary level
  - Consideration is given to reviewing and aligning the criteria for the Inclusion centres for Language Disorder and Communication and Interaction and developing inclusion centres for pupils with learning difficulties.

- It is predicted that the number of children and young people with autism will increase. Parents and professionals cite high functioning autism as a gap in provision. A number of children and young people with low functioning autism and challenging behaviour are being educated in out of city schools. It is recommended that:
  - A graduated range of provision should be available from autism friendly schools; autism champions within each school; outreach support potentially from a newly established peripatetic team; inclusion centres with varying and flexible levels of withdrawal / integration; special school.
o A new free school is established to support young people with more complex needs and challenging behaviours associated with autism including those who have historically been placed in out of city schools

o A sensory integration service is established

- With the increase in age range of statutory protection up to 25 years it is anticipated that the numbers of EHCPs for young people Post 16 and Post 19 will increase resulting in the need to develop a better offer to meet this need. It is recommended that:
  o The Local Authority continues to work proactively with Post 16 Colleges to develop their offer and help them to prepare for the increase in demand
  o The Local Authority develops a robust transition process working proactively with parents and young people from Year 9 onwards to prepare them for transition and manage expectations regarding future provision
  o The overlap and partnership working between children’s and adult services is strengthened to ensure that young people's needs are being identified early and appropriate provision planned and agreed with parents in advance.
  o It is recommended that a range of provisions is developed / expanded to include supported living alongside education, supported internships, apprenticeships etc.
  o The offer of specialist Post 19 provision is increased for those pupils with the most complex needs

- In order to promote inclusive practice in Portsmouth there are barriers that need to be addressed:
  o One is scrutiny of schools performance by Ofsted, and in particular the way in which school performance is reported, which can potentially act as a disincentive for schools who would otherwise wish to accommodate and support pupils with SEND. Some of the resourced provisions within Southampton are now managed by the relevant Special School with results allocated accordingly and therefore not affecting the performance of the mainstream host school.
  o The second is the impact on school budgets, particularly Element 2 funding. Those mainstream schools that are highly inclusive have strong leadership and a whole school ethos that supports inclusion. They recognise the importance of meeting a child's emotional, social and therapeutic needs in order for the child to learn. As a result they report spending significant time on social issues and pressures on budgets.
• A number of children and young people are being educated in high cost out of city schools. It is suggested, that with investment, many of these children’s needs could be met within the city releasing significant savings. It is recommended that the following investment is considered:
  o Residential provision / short breaks to prevent family breakdown, support those young people whose needs have too great an impact on the family, for young people who need 24 hour wrap around provision
  o Development of the Harbour Vanguard Key Stage 4 provision focussing on a vocational curriculum which will be better equipped to meet the needs and interests of the most vulnerable young people with the most challenging behaviour
1 Introduction

In January 2017 the Department for Education announced an allocation of funding for all local authorities to carry out a strategic review of their high needs provision.

Within a letter sent by Edward Timpson, Minister of State for Vulnerable Children and Families, to local authority Directors of Children’s Services in March 2017, the expectations of the review were laid out:

'We expect authorities to work with maintained schools, academies, free schools and others to agree how special educational needs should be met across their area, including considering the best ways of supporting mainstream schools to meet these needs, for example through access to specialist services. Local authorities will need to consider the range of specialist provision available, and how the places available in special schools, special units and resourced provision meet the changing needs of children and young people. It will also be important for local authorities to factor in what non-maintained and independent special schools offer, and what the diverse range of providers can contribute for children with SEN and disabilities in their early years and young people in further education. We also encourage collaboration with neighbouring local authorities and local clinical commissioning groups so that special provision can be commissioned and funded efficiently, and in a way that achieves the best possible outcomes for children and young people.'

With an expectation of joint working between neighbouring authorities, Portsmouth City Council (PCC) and Southampton City Council (SCC), as statistical neighbours, decided to pool their allocation and undertake a joint review to open up the opportunity of in-depth comparisons in provision across the two cities and the learning that this could potentially offer.

In June 2017 PCC and SCC appointed a review team to carry out a comprehensive strategic review of the provision for Portsmouth and Southampton children and young people (aged 0-25) with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

The key aim of the review was to ensure that future demands could be met which were financially sustainable and included consideration of the continuum of provision available to meet the range of identified need, as well as the sufficiency of provision going forward.

The Review has built on the work that had already been undertaken in Portsmouth and Southampton and is underpinned by the Children and Families Act 2014 and the SEND Strategies that are in place in the two cities.
2 Background - national and local strategy and policy

The Children and Families Act was published in 2014 and introduced significant changes to the ways that services are provided for children and young people (0-25) with SEND and their families.

The vision of the SEND reforms was of a clearer system which joins up help across education, health and care, from birth to 25. The Act has given a sharper focus to early identification and support, aspirations and outcomes; it has promoted a family centred system with greater engagement with children and young people and families, and improved transition to adulthood. It aligns with the broad aim of providing the best possible education and prospects for all children, regardless of their circumstances and background.

The former system was deemed not to be working effectively for families and children. Key changes were based on the premise that for many children and young people their needs cannot be met solely by any one agency and require organisations to work together. Parents are central to meeting their child’s needs and as such must be treated as an equal partner in determining and managing their child’s care. In order for parents to support their children they need information.

Key changes brought in by the Children and Families Act included:

1. Joint planning and commissioning of services to ensure close co-operation between education, health and social care commissioning
2. Local offer
3. Integrated assessment process
4. Education, Health and Care Plan
5. Personal budgets
6. Extended statutory protections 0-25
7. Same duties apply to Maintained schools, Academies, Free Schools, Further Education and Sixth Form colleges
8. Placing children and families at the centre of decision making ensuring they receive support and Independent advice

The Children and Families Act has brought about the biggest change in policy and practice since the Warnock report and the 1981 Education Act. Three years on from the introduction of these changes considerable work has been undertaken in both cities and significant progress made in implementing the reforms. Inevitably it will take time to embed all the changes and there are challenges that will impact on the intended outcomes of the reforms, including:

- an increasingly challenging financial climate
- an increase in need/demand beyond expectations
- changes to the curriculum and assessment
• an inspection system that focusses on pupil attainment with less emphasis on progress across a broader range of outcomes

Whilst the focus of the SEND Strategic Review is the sufficiency, range and affordability of provisions for children and young people with special educational needs and not the systems or processes that underpin the reforms, the review has highlighted a number of areas of good practice and areas requiring improvement that are integral to providers delivering the successful outcomes that are central to the overall aims of the reforms and the strategic plans of both cities.

The SEND Strategic Review has been aligned to the aims of Portsmouth’s SEND Strategy and has made links with the six strands of the overarching strategy outlined below.

The stated aim of the SEND strategy in Portsmouth is to promote inclusion and improve the outcomes for Portsmouth children and young people aged 0-25 years with SEND and their families.

In order to improve outcomes, the aim is to ensure that there are in place a range of high quality support services that contribute to removing the barriers to achievement for all Portsmouth children and young people, in particular those with special educational needs and disabilities. This includes enabling children and young people to lead healthy lives and achieve wellbeing; to benefit from education or training, with support, if necessary, to ensure that they can make progress in their learning; to build and maintain positive social and family relationships; to develop emotional resilience and make successful transitions to employment, higher education and independent living.

There are six strands of the SEND Strategy:

Strand A: Promote good inclusive practice to improve outcomes

Strand B: Successful implementation of the SEND reforms

Strand C: Effective joint commissioning to improve outcomes

Strand D: Co-production, embedded as a way of working with children, young people and their parents and carers

Strand E: Early identification and early support for children with SEND and their families

Strand F: Effective preparation for adulthood and smooth transitions to adult services
The delivery of the SEND Strategy is supported by a comprehensive governance and accountability framework which ensures that all activities are co-ordinated and monitored to achieve overall outcomes.

In recognition of the work already undertaken and in progress in Portsmouth regarding SEND Reform Implementation plans, the strategic review has endeavoured to build on, complement and support this work. The review team have attended and contributed to a number of task and finish groups and reported progress through the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group and SEND Board.
3 Scope of review

The review team was charged with undertaking a comprehensive strategic review of the provision for Portsmouth and Southampton children and young people (0-25) with SEND, to ensure that future demands can be met which are financially sustainable. This was to include consideration of the continuum of provision available to meet the range of identified need, as well as the sufficiency of provision going forward.

Priorities

With a focus on financial sustainability, it was agreed by both City Councils that the review would focus on six key priorities, namely:

1. Reviewing the use of high cost out of city placements, where provision is not available locally
2. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs, which is currently putting pressure on special school places
3. Reviewing the availability of post-16 provision for students with SEND, including for those with a sensory impairment
4. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children and young people with autism/social communication needs and associated sensory processing difficulties and challenging behaviour
5. Reviewing the use of inclusion centres
6. Reviewing the identification of SEND and thresholds for requesting EHCP needs assessments

As a key principle and aim of the Portsmouth SEND Strategy, inclusion and inclusive practice has also been explored due to its importance as part of a graduated response to meeting the needs of children with SEND.

The review did not focus on the Harbour School in depth as this was not one of the six key priorities identified. It is however acknowledged that social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) is an important area of need, and provision for pupils with SEMH will be influenced in Portsmouth by the findings and recommendations of the review.
4 Financial context

In 2017 the Association of Directors of Children’s Services (ADCS) issued a high needs funding survey\(^1\) to all Directors of Children’s Services. The results of the survey do not come as a surprise but reinforce the issues faced in Portsmouth.

Headline messages from the survey were:

- Across the 85 LAs who responded, the planned high needs block budget for 2016/17 was £2.95 billion and the actual spend was £3.08 billion
- 68 local authorities reported an overspend totalling £139.5 million
- The most common means of managing an overspend were: utilising Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserves; transferring funding from the schools and early years block; and/ or carrying the high needs block deficit forward.

Local authorities were asked about the specific issues which were driving demand and cost pressures in the high needs budget and from the received responses, three themes emerged:

- the increase in numbers of children with SEND related to the extension of support to young people up to the age of 25 and early identification of additional needs, particularly in the early years;
- increasing complexity of need; and
- a lack of capacity within mainstream settings to provide a graduated response to additional needs before turning to statutory processes.

The ADCS will continue to use the results from the survey to stress the need for continued support around the implementation of the SEND reforms, the need to address the financial impact resulting from the reforms and a funding system that adequately reflects the needs of children with SEND.

\(^1\) ADCS High Needs Fund Survey Summary http://adcs.org.uk/sen/article/high-needs-fund-survey-summary
5 Methodology

The review was undertaken over a 10 month period and allowed the review team the opportunity to explore in depth the range of issues affecting the current provision and likely to impact on future provision.

From the outset the review team sought to engage widely with all stakeholders involved in SEND within the city to ensure that a breadth of knowledge and opinion was gained to inform the review findings (see Appendix 1 for all those consulted).

The team met with young people and parents to listen to and understand their views about identification of needs, diagnosis, support and provision and to ensure these views were reflected in the ensuing recommendations. It is hoped this consultation will evolve into co-production as and when specific recommendations are taken further.

The review was conducted concurrently across the two cities, allowing direct comparisons to be made about how needs were being met.

The review involved research and enquiry of the evidence base to inform practice; benchmarking against statistical neighbours and national databases; information gathering and data analysis; visits to a range of provisions across the city and meetings with stakeholders across education, social care, health and the voluntary sector, parents and children / young people.

A number of key lines of enquiry were followed most notably:

- Data on the incidence and prevalence of SEND
- The current range and level of SEND within the city
- The range and extent of provision within the city including spend
- Parents, young people and other stakeholders’ views about the range of provision within the city
- Identification of the range of factors likely to affect future need
- Methodologies for forecasting
- Potential provision required to meet future need and costing

The outcome of the review has been a set of recommendations divided into 3 levels:

- Level 1 - require no further consultation, are relatively straightforward to implement and cost neutral
- Level 2 - may require some consultation and planning
- Level 3 - require further consultation and planning, and may require investment / funding
These outcomes have been shared widely throughout the second half of the review and have on the whole been received favourably with further refining of recommendations taking place on the basis of feedback received.
6 Brief overview of Portsmouth and Southampton Cities

In the national context Portsmouth and Southampton are similarly sized port cities located on the south coast of England. They both have large and thriving university populations and busy retail centres (Gunwharf Quays in Portsmouth and West Quay in Southampton) which draw in people from a wide area.

They are both unitary authorities with strong links with neighbouring towns in Hampshire (Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant and Waterlooville) which combined form the metropolitan area of South Hampshire.

Despite a strengthening of the economies of both cities, the populations continue to experience high levels of deprivation, relatively poor health and educational outcomes.

For planning purposes they are considered to be very close statistical neighbours, allowing comparisons to be made with regard to the needs, demands and provisions to children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities.

Both cities have a diverse population which is ever changing and difficult to predict. Whilst both cities are expecting population growth over the next 5-10 years the rate of growth and impact on the numbers of children and young people with SEND is difficult to determine due to a range of factors including:

- Increasing birth rates
- Inward migration
- A reduction and change in pattern in the number of children going to schools outside of the Local Authority area due to pressures on school places in Hampshire and the increasing number of schools in Portsmouth judged as good or outstanding by Ofsted
- Impact of housing developments and regeneration schemes
- Reduction in the number of children accessing independent education
7 Portsmouth City demographic data

The current (2017) population of Portsmouth is 210,259 (HCC SAPF 2016)\(^2\) with a projected growth of 11% over the next 20 years mainly due to increasing longevity of people 65yrs+. The proportion of the total population aged 0-19 years is estimated to slightly decline from 24.3% to 23.6%\(^3\).

The current (2017) Portsmouth population of 0-19 year olds is 49,949\(^4\).

As a successful University city with a large number of students, the population of 18 year olds doubles increasing to a population of around 5,000 for each of the years 19-25 (compared to an average population per year group of 2300). As a result predictions of need of Post 19 pupils must be adjusted accordingly.

Portsmouth is the most densely populated city in the UK outside of London.

Deprivation levels are high with Portsmouth ranked 63rd of 326 local authorities (previously ranked 76th of 326 local authorities in 2010, and 93rd of 354 authorities in 2007) where 1 is the most deprived in terms of the average score\(^3\). 22% of all dependent children under the age of 20 years are living in poverty, which is above the England average with levels at twice the national average in some areas of the city (e.g. Charles Dickens ward). The percentage of pupils known to be eligible and claiming free school meals is higher than the national average, reflecting low incomes in the city.

The city has an ethnically diverse population with 20% of school-age children being of non-White British ethnicity. Over 100 languages are spoken by pupils attending Portsmouth schools.

In line with high levels of deprivation, Portsmouth residents experience poorer health and wellbeing on a range of key measures than the national average including children living in poverty and attainment at GCSE level.

---

\(^2\) Hampshire County Council (HCC) Small Area Population Forecast 2016
\(^3\) Portsmouth Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Annual Summary 2016
\(^4\) HCC data supplied to PCC Education, Information and Performance Team in 2017)
8 Current need and demand

A note about data

Understanding current need and provision and predicting the need for future provision is reliant on having up to date and reliable information.

The sources of information that the Review Team accessed included:

- Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecast 2016 data (HCC SAPF 2016)
- Schools census
- SEN 2 return
- Portsmouth City Council Needs Assessment
- Portsmouth City Council SEND team data
- Local Government Inform (LG Inform)
- Local Authority Interactive Tool (LAIT)

Portsmouth City Council's Performance and Information Team has been helpful throughout and generous with their time. The analysis and interpretation of information available has been challenging and has not always supported the narrative as it is experienced on the ground or reported elsewhere. The review team have tried to ensure that the source of all data is clearly identified and have attempted to make sense of information that may seem inconsistent or at odds with perceived trends.

In particular it must be noted that the reported prevalence of SEND by the Department of Education (DfE) and used in national datasets is based on January school census data. These figures include all pupils that attend one of the following Portsmouth schools as at January Census Day and is considered to be the most accurate data on which to analyse need and base predictions:

- academies including free schools
- maintained and non-maintained special schools
- primary, infant and junior schools
- all-through schools
- university technology colleges
- direct grant nursery schools
- pupil referral units
- general hospital schools
- independent schools

As this data includes all pupils attending a Portsmouth school it will include a small number of pupils from other local authorities e.g. Hampshire and the Isle of Wight who attend a Portsmouth school but does not include Portsmouth children who attend a school outside of Portsmouth.
In contrast the SEN2 data return includes all Portsmouth children, wherever they are educated and is referenced throughout the report as SEN2 Return.

To illustrate the challenge, the number of children with a statement or EHCP in the January census was 943 compared to the SEN2 Return of 1254, which is a difference of 311.

Similarly the population used in the January census is generally based on the YR-Y11 Portsmouth school population which for 2017 was 28,581, whereas the SEN2 Return considers all children and young people 0-25 years which for 2017 was 49,949 (0-19); 77,590 (0-25).

In identifying need the review team has drawn from the Portsmouth City Council's SEND database where children are identified according to their primary need. There are currently 13 categories of special educational need, that have been nationally determined by the DfE, and are assigned to children with statements or Education, Health and Care Plans or who are receiving SEN Support. The child's primary need can be assigned by the school or early years setting or by the Inclusion Support Panel and SEND team when a plan is finalised. This is often when the child is relatively young and as a result can change over time as the child's needs become more apparent or may change. For example some young children with speech, language and communication difficulties may receive a diagnosis of autism. Whilst the primary need is reviewed annually at the Annual Review of the Education, Health and Care Plan it is rarely amended on the database, partly as there is no place on the Annual review paperwork where this is recorded. As a result many children have codes assigned to them which are now out of date leading to difficulties in reviewing the level and range of needs, understanding changing needs over time and planning.

Finally the data on SEND is continually changing and as such may look different if reported at different times. As a result the team used published data wherever possible whilst also trying to ensure that the report is up to date. With sources identified and where possible verified, every attempt has been made to ensure that information is valid.

It is recommended that the process of coding, recording and amending primary need is reviewed with the aim of establishing a robust process to inform future planning and provision.

**Recommendation 8.1:** A review of the process of coding, recording and amending primary need to be undertaken by the SEND and Information Teams with the aim of establishing a robust system to inform future planning and provision.
Recommendation 8.2: High importance should be attached to leaders from the SEND, Information and Finance Teams, the School Organisation Team, Portsmouth CCG, Health Providers and Social Care meeting annually to share and collate data to ensure that the city has an accurate picture of all the children with SEND, how needs, numbers and costs are changing to support continuous improvement and review, planning and future forecasting. This should link with the Needs Assessment and report into the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.

Current Need

Producing a Needs Assessment is a statutory requirement to facilitate successful implementation of the SEND reforms set out in the Children and Families Act 2014 and an updated version for 2017 was produced in October 2017. Drawing on a range of local and national data sets as well as qualitative information, Portsmouth City Council Joint Commissioning Group uses the Needs Assessment to identify the needs of children and young people aged 0-25 years with SEND in Portsmouth and inform shared planning and commissioning decisions about the most effective way to meet these needs, specifically:

- To identify the population, prevalence and characteristics of children and young people who have special educational needs and disabilities in Portsmouth
- To understand current needs and demand for services, and how this may change in future
- To provide an overview of current provision
- To provide an evidence base and shared understanding of needs and the effectiveness of provision, to inform the development of joint priority outcomes and commissioning plans
- To identify any gaps in our knowledge, and improvements in relation to data collection, analysis and use

This report will draw from its findings to inform the recommendations made with regard to provision.

Estimating need is highly problematic due to widely varying research methodology. Similarly determining current need is difficult due to the lack of a single register; differences in data collected across agencies and services; the co-occurrence of disabilities which can result in double counting, or the counting of the primary need but not secondary needs; out of date coding; and within child changes in presentation and needs that can occur over time.
Best estimates of the prevalence of special educational needs and/or disabilities in children and young people aged 0-18 years ranges from 3% (Disabled children with SEN and in receipt of Disability Living Allowance known to Local Authorities (LAs)) to 7.3% (Family Resources Survey 2007 for Department for Work and Pensions which uses the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) measure of disability)⁵. In Portsmouth this equates to a prevalence within the 0-19 years population (49,949) of 1,498 (3%) to 3,646 (7.3%). From research the DDA measure of disability has been concluded as the best source for estimating national prevalence⁶. However it should be acknowledged that this is a national prevalence which may not account for variations between local authorities.

Adding together the number of children on SEN Support and those with EHC plans, the number of children and young people with SEND in Portsmouth schools and colleges is currently 4,454 or 8.9% of the 0-19 population of 49,949 and 15.6% of the school aged population of 28,581 (January School Census 2017)). This is higher than identified in the Thomas Coram research and national rates of SEND⁷ (15.6% compared to 15% nationally). Whilst this may be a reflection of high levels of deprivation it may also be due to over-identification. In addition, of all the children identified with SEND, a smaller proportion of children will be in receipt of DDA.

The numbers of pupils in Portsmouth schools with SEND at January 2017 was

EHCP / statements = 940 (3.3%)
SEN Support = 3,514 (12.3%)

**Figure 8.1 - Percentage of pupils with a statement or EHCP 2014 - 2017**

(Source: LG Inform)

---

⁵ Thomas Coram Research Unit, University of London for the Department for children, schools and families 2008. Disabled children: numbers, characteristics and local service provision.
⁷ LG Inform
Over the last 5 years the numbers of pupils with a statement or EHCP in Portsmouth has been relatively constant at around 3.1%, slightly above the national average of 2.8% and on a par with statistical neighbours (range 2.5%-3.6%). In 2017 this percentage increased to 3.3% as did the national average to 2.9% (Figure 8.1). The increase in EHC plans is in line with anecdotal reports from health, early years settings and schools who describe an increase in the number of children and young people with SEND albeit often pupils with more complex needs. Whilst this increase is in part due to increased need, complexity and the wider age range now eligible for an EHCP, it is also considered to be a consequence of prioritising the transfer of statements over to EHCPs by the DfE deadline of 31 March 2018 rather than using resources to cease statements where they may no longer be needed. In other words, more plans have been agreed and fewer have been ceased in the first three years of the Children and Families Act (Table 8.1).

### Table 8.1 - Number of new and discontinued statements / EHCPs 2010 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of new statements/EHCPs</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of discontinued statements/EHCPs</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SEN2 Return)

In contrast, the number of children on SEN Support has decreased over the last 5 years from 17.9% (2013/14) to 12.3% (2017) (Figure 8.2). This change is reflected both nationally (17.9% → 11.6%) and by statistical neighbours (19.66% → 12.09%). Portsmouth has seen an even steeper decline in the proportion of young people identified as having SEN, with a 39% drop since 2009 bringing Portsmouth roughly in line with the national average.

There are a number of factors that could explain this decrease. The Children and Families Act 2014 combined the categories of School Action and School Action Plus into one category of SEN Support. It is hypothesised that those formerly identified at School Action were children with low attainment but who may not have had SEN. This would contribute to the reduction of children at SEN Support. In addition there has been more accurate identification of those with SEN following implementation of the SEND reforms as opposed to those supported by Pupil Premium which is additional funding to raise the attainment of disadvantages pupils of all abilities and close the gaps between them and their peers.
As shown in figures 8.3 and 8.4 below, comparing Portsmouth data with statistical neighbours suggests that Portsmouth is:

- just above the median for the percentage of children with a statement or EHCP (3.3%) and above the average of all statistical neighbours (2.99%), the average for the South East (3%) and the national average (2.8%)

- lower (12.3%) than the average for all statistical neighbours (12.71%) for the number of pupils on SEN Support but higher compared to the South East average (11.1%) and the national average (11.6%).

Figure 8.3 - % of pupils with a statement or EHCP compared to statistical neighbours
The higher numbers of pupils with SEND in Portsmouth may reflect the high levels of deprivation within the city and / or issues with regard to identification.

In understanding these percentage changes within the context of need and demand it is important to see how this relates to the actual numbers of children with SEND and how this has changed relative to the population over time (Table 8.2).

Table 8.2 - Number of pupils with SEND in Portsmouth schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All SEN</td>
<td>7329</td>
<td>7151</td>
<td>6772</td>
<td>6581</td>
<td>6376</td>
<td>5655</td>
<td>4572</td>
<td>4075</td>
<td>4454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Support</td>
<td>6477</td>
<td>6319</td>
<td>5935</td>
<td>5759</td>
<td>5527</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>3213</td>
<td>3514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN with a</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: January School Census)

These percentage changes relate to pupils attending a Portsmouth school as reported in the January census. However Portsmouth has responsibility for a wider group of children who live in Portsmouth and attend schools elsewhere as captured in the SEN2 Return shown below (Table 8.3). It is important to keep the needs of these other 300 pupils in mind when predicting future numbers.
Table 8.3 - Number of Portsmouth children with a statement or EHCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEN with a</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SEN2 Return)

Whilst the percentage and number of pupils with a statement or EHCP has been relatively constant over the period 2009 - 2016 the increase in 2017 has resulted in an additional 78 plans. In contrast whilst there has been a slight upward turn in children requiring SEN Support in 2017 the number needing support overall has reduced since 2009 by 2,963 (46%). Overall the numbers of pupils identified with SEND has reduced from 7,329 (2009) to 4,454 (2017) with the ratio of EHCP:SEN Support changing from 1:8 to 1:4 (Table 8.2).

The SEND Review Team anticipate that once all statements have been transferred the percentage of EHCPs could return to 3.1% and the percentage of children requiring SEN Support will plateau at around 12.3%.
Within Portsmouth the most common primary areas of need vary between primary and secondary phased schools and special schools (See Table 8.4 and Appendices 3a - c).

### Table 8.4 - % of SEND pupils by primary need and school type, Jan 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Need</th>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Special Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>SN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound &amp; Multiple Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Emotional &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech, Language &amp; Communication</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sensory Impairment</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Support but no specialist assessment of type of need</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SN = Statistical neighbour)  (Source: DfE Statistical First Release SEN Local Authority Tables)

The most common primary areas of need in primary phased schools are:
- Speech, Language & Communication Needs higher than national, on a par with SN
- Moderate Learning Difficulty on a par with national and SN
- Social, Emotional & Mental Health higher than national and SN

The most common primary areas of need in secondary phased schools are:
- Social, Emotional & Mental Health higher than national and SN
- Specific Learning Difficulty higher than national and SN
- Moderate Learning Difficulty lower than national and SN
The most common primary areas of need in special schools are:

- Autism lower than national and SN
- Severe learning difficulty on a par with national and lower than SN
- Social, Emotional and Mental Health higher than national and SN

The change in primary need between phases may be explained by a difference in the way that needs are recorded in primary and secondary settings and/or because of the change in presentation of need between primary and secondary aged pupils. For example social, emotional and mental health difficulties can become more apparent at secondary age whilst speech, language and communication difficulties may have resolved by secondary age or been identified as the early presentation of autism or a more generalised developmental delay.

Of interest are the numbers of children with autism in primary and secondary mainstream schools, which is lower than national and statistical neighbours; and the number of children with speech, language and communication needs in special schools which is double the national average and statistical neighbours. Portsmouth now has an established Autism assessment pathway and in the past two years there has been a noticeable increase in the numbers of children receiving a diagnosis of autism.

**Prevalence of autism**

The latest prevalence studies of autism indicate that 1.1% of the population in the UK may be on the autism spectrum\(^8\). With a school aged population of 28,581 this would equate to 314 pupils presenting with autism in 2017. The numbers of children with a primary need of autism in Portsmouth is 260 (January 2017 school census) which is below the expected rate and also below the average of all English unitary authorities\(^9\).

However, since 2013 there has been a steady increase in Portsmouth in the number of young people with a primary need of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (from 184 in 2013 to 260 in 2017). In April 2015, Solent NHS Trust implemented two new Autism & Neurodevelopmental pathways, one for children under 6 years and the other for 6-18 year olds which has resulted in a significant increase in the numbers of children and young people receiving a diagnosis.

The Review team have investigated the rise in the diagnosis of autism. With the introduction of the autism pathway in Portsmouth, children are being identified as having autism at an earlier age and this is now being coded as the primary need. In

---


\(^9\) LG Inform
the past children may have initially been identified either with a speech, language and communication or behavioural need with autism coded as a secondary need following diagnosis in later childhood. Parents and professionals in the city generally agree that there is now earlier and better identification of children and young people with autism. There is now an understanding of the autism spectrum as a continuum, which has increased the number of children identified, some with milder forms of autism. This is not an issue unique to Portsmouth. The notion of ‘diagnostic substitution’ has been described by Paul Shattuck, PhD, Assistant Professor of Social Work at Washington University in St. Louis. He accounts for the increase by explaining that children who were once labelled as "mentally retarded" are now more accurately described as having autism and / or a learning disability. It is important that data held on children is updated to reflect changes in need or a new diagnosis.

As knowledge continues to advance, some professionals consider that the term "neurodiversity" may be more helpful to highlight the uniqueness of each individual presenting with a range of strengths and needs. An area of consensus between parents and professionals is that no two children with autism are the same.

**Prevalence of learning difficulties**

Determining the prevalence of learning difficulties is complicated by the lack of clarity as to what is regarded to be included within that term. It is generally used to encompass moderate, severe and profound multiple learning difficulties. Prevalence is reported to be between 2.5 - 3% with higher prevalence rates being attributed to children due to mortality rates in adults.\(^\text{10}\)

With a school aged population of 28,581 this equates to 857 (3%) children.

Within a population of children with learning difficulties approximately 80% will have a moderate learning difficulty; 15% a severe learning difficulty and 5% profound and multiple learning difficulties.

For Portsmouth this would equate to:

- 686 children with moderate learning difficulties (MLD)
- 128 children with severe learning difficulties (SLD)
- 43 children with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD)

Work conducted by the Centre for Disability Research on behalf of the Department for Health suggested that the estimated prevalence of PMLD in children (aged under 18) is on average 1.34 per 1,000 children. With a school aged population of 28,581

---

PHE Learning Disabilities Observatory "People with learning disabilities in England 2015: Main report November 2016"
this equates to 38 children. With a predicted increase in prevalence of 4.8% per year\textsuperscript{11} it is estimated that this number will increase by approximately 2 children per year.

The actual number of children in Portsmouth is\textsuperscript{12}

- 769 children with moderate learning difficulty (the numbers in primary and special schools is on a par with the national average but significantly below the national average in secondary schools\textsuperscript{13})
- 124 children with severe learning difficulty (which is below the national average)
- 34 children with profound and multiple learning difficulties (which is below expected prevalence and national average)

### Prevalence of social, emotional and mental health difficulties (SEMH)

The most recent British surveys carried out by the Office for National Statistics of children and young people aged 5–15 years in 1999 and 2004 (referred to as the British Child and Adolescent Mental Health Surveys or B-CAMHS) found that 10% had a clinically diagnosable mental disorder (i.e. a mental health problem associated with significant impairment). Among the 5 to 10 year olds, 10% of boys and 5% of girls had a mental disorder while among the 11 to 16 year olds the prevalence was 13% for boys and 10% for girls. In these two surveys the prevalence of anxiety disorders was 2–3%, depression 0.9%, conduct disorder 4.5–5%, hyperkinetic disorder (severe ADHD) 1.5% and autism spectrum disorders 0.9%. Rarer disorders including selective mutism, eating disorders and tics occurred in 0.4% of children. Conduct disorders, hyperkinetic disorder and autism spectrum disorders were more common in boys, and emotional disorders were more common in girls\textsuperscript{14}.

With a school aged population of 28,581 this equates to 2,858 (10%) children. A number of these children will not have SEN.

The number of children in Portsmouth with SEMH as their primary need is 756\textsuperscript{12} and above the national average.

The Code of Practice introduced the term “social, emotional and mental health” to replace “social, emotional and behavioural” needs and this has helped to focus on the meaning behind the presenting behaviour and to address the underlying needs. An increasing number of children and young people are experiencing social emotional and mental health needs (SEMH). Many children and young people with


\textsuperscript{12} January 2017 School census

\textsuperscript{13} LG Inform

\textsuperscript{14} Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer 2012. Our Children Deserve Better: Prevention Pays - Rates and profile of mental health problems among children and young people
SEMH also have speech, language and communication needs and may have other co-occurring difficulties such as Attention Deficit Disorder (ADHD), Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD), insecure attachment or conduct disorder. Young people who find themselves part of the Youth Justice system may have experienced social, emotional and mental health issues. National research\footnote{Hughes N and Chitsabesan P, 2015. Supporting young people with neurodevelopmental impairment. Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.} has found a higher prevalence of SEND in young people in custody compared to the general youth population (Table 8.5).

**Table 8.5 - Prevalence of neurodevelopmental disorders in young people, and in young people in custody**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>General youth population</th>
<th>Young people in custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication disorders</td>
<td>5 - 7 %</td>
<td>60 - 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>2 - 4 %</td>
<td>23 - 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic spectrum disorder</td>
<td>0.6 - 15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention deficit/Hyperactivity disorder</td>
<td>1.7 - 9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foetal alcohol spectrum disorder</td>
<td>0.1 - 5%</td>
<td>10.9 - 11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many children and young people who are Looked after children (LAC) or Looked after children and young people (LACYP) also have SEMH.
Prevalence of speech, language and communication needs (SLCN)

Nationally it is estimated that approximately 10% of children have some form of long term and persistent speech, language and communication difficulty. In deprived areas a further 50-80% of children start school with impoverished language / delayed communication skills.\(^{16}\)

This 10% is made up of:

- 7% of children with speech, language and communication difficulties as their main difficulty. This is also referred to as developmental language disorder (formerly specific language impairment) and is often severe and complex.
- 3% of children with speech, language and communication difficulties as part of another condition such as autism, hearing impairment or general learning difficulty. Of these children an estimated 1% of children have the most severe and complex speech, language and communication difficulties.

For Portsmouth, a 7% prevalence within the YR-Y4 school population would be 834. (This age range is used as the speech and language difficulties of many children will be managed within ordinarily available provision by the age of 8-9 years of age).

The actual numbers of children with SLCN as their primary need is 899.\(^{17}\) Portsmouth prevalence is slightly higher than national average at primary level and on a par at secondary level.

It is likely that there is a degree of under-identification of speech, language and communication difficulties and acceptance of poor language skills as the norm for much of the population. However with good language modelling many children can make good progress during their primary years.

Demand

Whilst identifying need is not always as straightforward as it should be, using need as the basis for determining provision is even more problematic due to the effect of demand.

Interviews with parents and professionals have revealed a shift towards parents wanting a special school for their child or young person. Special school provision is now considered to be specialist provision where once it may have been viewed
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\(^{16}\) The Communication Trust
\(^{17}\) January 2017 school census
much less positively. This is particularly so at secondary level where parents are concerned about transition and the support that will be available.

The demand for special school places has increased year on year and despite increasing the number of places available the schools are always full. Whether this indicates a true increase in need or demand meeting capacity whatever that may be is difficult to determine. However comments made by Special School staff, professionals and parents combined with observations by the Review Team would suggest that there are children and young people incorrectly placed who are contributing to this pressure.

Parents, quite understandably, can be influenced by professionals who work closely with their child and/or whom they trust. Anecdotal evidence indicates that parental demand for special school provision may be shaped at least in part by views and comments from professionals. This is not a problem in itself but can become problematic when expectations cannot be met due to potentially misleading or confusing information given to parents. A shared understanding amongst all professionals of Portsmouth’s strategic approach to meeting SEND, policy and processes is essential.

Over the last 10 years there has been increasing recognition of the importance of considering parents as equal partners in the support of children with SEND. This was made more explicit in the SEND reforms of 2014 with the introduction of the local offer as a way of ensuring that parents had access to information on SEND provision, the statutory requirement to include parents as co-producers in the EHC planning process and the development of local and national Parent Voice groups. The concept of co-production was introduced with parent representatives now involved in all aspects of SEND planning, development and delivery.

This increased involvement of parents and the encouragement to ‘use their voice’ has resulted in parents feeling empowered and having higher awareness and expectations of what should be provided for their child and all children with SEND.

At the same time the increasing demands of the curriculum and wider social needs has put pressure on mainstream schools; whilst special school provision has improved in terms of ethos, quality, standards and environment.
As a result the demand for high quality child centred provision has increased particularly the demand for special school provision. As more special school places have been created to meet this demand they have been quickly filled creating a pull for continued demand.

**Conclusion**

Table 8.6 - Comparison of estimated prevalence v current identified need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Estimated prevalence applied to Portsmouth school population (28,581)</th>
<th>Current need in Portsmouth</th>
<th>Comparison with national average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>7.3% = 2,086</td>
<td>4,454 = 16%</td>
<td>Higher than national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>1.1% = 314</td>
<td>260 = 0.91%</td>
<td>Below national at primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below national at secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On a par with national in Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>3% = 857</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>Below national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>80% of above = 686</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>On a par with national at primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below national at secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On a par with national In Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>15% of above = 128</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Below national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLD</td>
<td>5% of above = 43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Below national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34/10,000 = 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMH</td>
<td>5% of the 10% of CYP with SEMH = 143</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>Above national at primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above national at secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above national in Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCN</td>
<td>7% = 2,000 of 28,581 and 7% of YR-Y4 = 834</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>Above national at primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On a par with national at secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The prevalence of SEND within Portsmouth is higher than national prevalence rates and may be a reflection of higher levels of deprivation and issues with identification.
- The percentage of children with SEND has been falling steadily in line with national data and statistical neighbours but is now expected to plateau at about 15%.
- The percentage of children with a statement or EHCP has been constant at 3.1% until 2017 when it increased to 3.3%. It is expected that the percentage of EHCPs will remain at 3.3% and/or drop back to 3.1%.
- The numbers of children with autism is below expected prevalence levels and cited frequently by schools and professionals as a growing area of need.
Unless research reveals otherwise the consensus of professionals is that the numbers will continue to increase for the next 3-5 years but will then plateau.

- The numbers of children in Portsmouth identified with a learning difficulty is roughly in line with expected prevalence levels. Research suggests that the numbers of children with more severe and complex learning difficulties will increase annually by approximately 4.8%.

- The number of children presenting with SEMH is considerably higher in Portsmouth than prevalence data would suggest. As a city with high levels of deprivation it is likely that rates of trauma, family breakdown, violence and neglect could be higher contributing to the numbers presenting with SEMH. Since the change of designation from BESD to SEMH there has been greater awareness of the impact of social and emotional issues on children and the consequent identification of children with SEMH. With increasing austerity and widespread social issues it is likely that the numbers of children and young people presenting with SEMH will continue to increase for some time.

- There is no national benchmark indicating how much Special School provision there should be in any one area with local provision being due to local policy, historical provision, areas of specialism and centres of excellence. For example, Cornwall has few Special Schools due to geography and access; the London borough of Newham has few Special Schools due to a policy of inclusion. Demand also plays a part and there is evidence that if Special School places are available they will be filled.
9 Current provision

Portsmouth City Council holds responsibility for commissioning specialist educational provision for children with statements or Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) to enable children with identified special educational needs to access suitable educational provision that meets their needs.

Portsmouth Children’s Trust has a stated commitment to ‘inclusion’, by which it is meant that the city aims to ensure that there are in place a range of high quality support services that contribute to removing the barriers to achievement for all Portsmouth children and young people, in particular those with special educational needs and disabilities. This includes enabling children and young people to benefit from education or training, with support, if necessary, to ensure that they can make progress in their learning, build and maintain positive social and family relationships, develop emotional resilience and make successful transitions to employment, higher education and independent living.

Mainstream schools and available support

The majority of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities will have their needs met within their local mainstream school. For some children, whose needs are complex and long term, an EHCP is necessary to make provision to meet their needs. There are 1378 (January 2018 SEN2 Return) children who have a statement or EHCP maintained by Portsmouth.

Of these, 36.5% are educated within a mainstream educational placement with support (down from 49.4% in 2013). This compares to the position nationally where 36.2% are in mainstream schools (down from 47.3%) and statistical neighbours at 33.7% (down from 43.5%) (Figure 9.1).

Whilst the majority of children are educated within Portsmouth schools, a small number are educated in schools within other local authorities, mainly Hampshire but also the Isle of Wight and West Sussex.

To strengthen inclusion, and support mainstream schools in meeting the needs of pupils with SEND, Portsmouth City Council commissions Portsmouth SEN Support Partnership (PSENSP) to deliver an outreach service. The Service provides support for schools across Portsmouth through a funded core service.

Schools can also access support from other Local Authority Services, such as Educational Psychology; from Health Services, such as, Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, School Nursing; and from Social Care Services.
Elective home education

The number of elective home educated (EHE) pupils with an EHC plan has decreased from 5 to 1 since 2013 and remains less than 1% of the total cohort of young people with statements of SEN and EHCP maintained by Portsmouth. In contrast the number of EHE pupils without an EHCP has risen and some parents report that they are choosing to educate children at SEN Support at home as they are losing confidence in mainstream school provision.

Inclusion Centres (additionally resourced provision within mainstream schools)

Some of the pupils in mainstream schools have the additional support of an Inclusion Centre which allows varying degrees of integration based on each pupil's needs. For Portsmouth, the percentage of children being placed in an inclusion centre has stayed static at around 6%, whilst nationally there has been a small increase of 0.5 percentage points to 6.2% (Figure 9.1).
There are 9 Inclusion Centres in Portsmouth. These offer specialist provision for children with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) requiring provision over and above what is ordinarily available within a mainstream setting. They also offer the opportunity for children to access some aspects of the mainstream curriculum and to be included with their mainstream peers where evidence collected as part of the EHCP process suggests that this is what is needed.

Inclusion Centres within the following schools cater for children with an EHCP identifying their primary area of need as communication and interaction difficulties (including speech, language and social communication difficulties):

- Devonshire Infant School - Key stage 1
- Southsea Infant School - Key stage 1
- Portsdown Primary School - Key stage 1 and 2
- Victory Primary School - Key stage 1 and 2

Inclusion Centres within the following schools cater for children with communication and interaction difficulties, in particular those with autism spectrum conditions:

- Milton Park Primary School
- Trafalgar School (Secondary)

Inclusion Centres within the following schools cater for children with a sensory impairment:

- Northern Parade Infant and Junior schools
- St Edmunds Catholic School (Secondary)

Inclusion Centres at the following mainstream school cater for children with Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties and also those in key stages 1 and 2 requiring a period of Alternative Provision (AP):

- The Flying Bull Primary Academy

Table 9.1 - The agreed place number (APN) and numbers on roll (NOR) of each Inclusion Centre 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion centre</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>NOR 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southsea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsdown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Parade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmunds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying Bull</td>
<td>14+2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Schools

Portsmouth has been above the number nationally of children and young people placed in a state-funded special school since 2012 but this had decreased to 39.5% by January 2017 (down from 49% in 2015). This decrease has been mirrored nationally where, in 2017, there were 36% of children in state-funded special schools (Figure 9.1).

There are 5 designated special schools in Portsmouth

- The Willows Centre for Children - Provides SEN places for nursery and Year R children, extending to Year 1 from September 2018, with a range of special educational needs and disabilities, alongside mainstream day care provision. Referrals for SEN places are via the Early Years Panel.

- Cliffdale Primary Academy - For key stage 1 & 2 pupils with complex learning difficulties who may also have autism.

- Redwood Park Academy - For key stage 3 & 4 pupils with complex learning difficulties who may also have autism.

- Mary Rose Academy - For pupils from nursery to key stage 5 with profound and multiple learning difficulties, severe and complex needs and autism. Some children may have a complexity of special educational needs including physical disabilities, complex medical conditions and varying degrees of sensory impairment. Some of the Post 16 pupils are educated in the Craneswater Annexe. These include some of the most vulnerable children. There are 6 places for students with severe autism and challenging behaviour requiring 2 adults to 1 student at all times and 15 places for Post 16 students with severe learning difficulties who may have other associated learning needs.

- The Harbour School - For upper key stage 2 (age 9) to key stage 4 pupils who have a wide range of Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs. The Harbour School consists of a number of educational services as well as on site educational provision. It can be broken down into the following:
  - On site education provision for learners with primarily social, emotional and mental health needs
  - Alternative Provision for pupils from Year 5 onwards requiring a time limited period of support outside of their mainstream school
  - Medical tuition for children who are not able to attend mainstream school for a period of time due to their medical needs.
  - Outreach support
Table 9.2 - The agreed place number (APN) and numbers on roll (NOR) of each Special School 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special school</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>NOR 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willows</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour</td>
<td>105 SEN / 95 AP</td>
<td>96 SEN /162 AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A small number of children are placed in special schools in other Local Authorities, mainly Hampshire.

**Out of city independent special schools**

There are a small number of children and young people who have been placed in out of city independent special schools due to the complexity of their needs.

Schools that currently have Portsmouth children and young people include:

- Hamilton Lodge School for the Deaf, Brighton
- St Catherine's, IOW
- Fairways, Fareham
- The Forum School, Dorset
- Hillcrest Park School, Oxfordshire
- The Serendipity Centre, Southampton
- Victoria Education Centre, Poole

- Mary Hare, Newbury
- St Edwards, Romsey
- Southlands, Lymington
- Grateley House, Andover
- Coxlease, New Forest
- Jubilee, Waterlooville
10 Findings of review

Whilst the brief of the review was to carry out a comprehensive review of the provision for Portsmouth and Southampton children and young people with SEND, the reviewers were given a number of priority areas to focus on which were considered to be the most important with regards to future financial stability, namely:

1. Reviewing the use of high cost out of city placements, where provision is not available locally
2. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs and associated pressure on special school places
3. Reviewing the availability of post-16 provision for students with SEND, including for those with a sensory impairment
4. Meeting the needs of the growing number of children and young people with autism/social communication needs and associated sensory processing difficulties and challenging behaviour
5. Reviewing the use of inclusion centres
6. Reviewing the identification of SEND and thresholds for requesting EHCP needs assessments
7. Inclusion

10.1 Reviewing the use of high cost out of city placements, where provision is not available locally

There are a number of children currently being educated in schools out of Portsmouth city (118 as at March 2018). Some are in maintained schools in other local authorities, mainly Hampshire (47); some are in other local authority special schools, mainly Hampshire (35); a small number are in independent private schools (funded by parents) and 36 children are in independent special schools.

It is this latter group that comprise the high cost out of city placements. 24 of these placements are residential and 12 are day placements. 30 are education led placements that are funded from the high needs block and 6 are social care led placements with education costs funded from the high needs block. These high cost out of city placements were identified as a priority due to the significant spend in this area against a High Needs Block that is overspent for 2018/19 (There are also a number of placements that are CAMHS led).

The funding of out of city placements is the most unpredictable and volatile area of the high needs funding block. Children may require a placement out of the city if either their education or social care needs or both cannot be met within the city.
Individual placement decisions can have a significant impact on the high needs block. Whilst the overall number of children placed out of the city has not increased significantly since 2014 (Table 10.1.1) and is low compared to national figures the average cost of provision has increased and is expected to continue to increase due to uplifts imposed by providers.

Table 10.1.1 Number of education led placements of children and young people in independent specialist out of city schools (January Schools Census return)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As at March 2018, Portsmouth has 36 children and young people in education and social care led independent specialist out of city placements at approximate costs of:

- **Education** - £2,177,796 (average £60,494 per student)
- **Social Care** - £1,589,294
- **Health** - £532,894
- **Transport** - £165,943

(Source: PCC Commissioning Contracts Officer/PCC Finance Team/PCC SEND Team)

It is recognised that for a small number of pupils the Local Authority will not be able to meet their needs due to their complexity. Some children have very specific and high level/low incidence individual needs that require highly specialist provision. Some children with social, emotional and mental health needs benefit from being placed out of the city to break a cycle of exploitation and harm even when educational needs might be met locally. Colleagues in the Children’s Disability Team and Social Care have explained that there are some children whose educational needs could be met locally but who are in out of city provision because the package of health and/or social care needs is so complex that family breakdown can become a risk. Some families experience increasing strain which impacts on siblings and family relationships. Shorts breaks (level three of the Portsmouth Short Breaks Policy) can help, and provide significant additional support from another person to enable participation in enjoyable activities. These specialist services include care and support within and outside the home; overnight short breaks and access to family link carers. Some will be provided by social care, such as overnight care, and others, which include specialist holiday play schemes and after school and evening activities, via Portsmouth City Council or the voluntary sector. Access to specialist services is determined through a social care assessment. However, this is often insufficient for those families whose children have the most complex needs. In most cases families do not wish their child to go out of city and have to make long journeys to see their children at infrequent intervals.
These children do however form only a small proportion of those currently in placements out of city (approximately 8-10 children). It is believed that with some additional investment and changes to the local offer that the majority of other pupils could have their needs met within the city schools releasing significant savings.

A number of findings have been identified during the course of the review which are relevant to the decision to seek out of city placement.

- **Lack of suitable educational provision within city**

The majority of pupils in out of city schools fall into two groups - SEMH (43%) or ASD (30%), with a small number having sensory difficulties, VI or HI and a small number with physical difficulties. There is a dearth of provision for children and young people with high functioning autism, those with autism and challenging behaviour and those requiring occupational therapy (therapeutic input) for sensory needs.

As already reported, the latest prevalence studies of autism indicate that 1.1% of the population in the UK may be on the autism spectrum. It is estimated that for approximately 5% of children and young people with SEMH there will be an impact on their learning for which they will need support. The prevalence of children and young people with SEMH and ASD is forecast to increase for some time yet. As these two groups can present with some of the most challenging behaviour it is imperative that future support, management and provision for these pupils is identified and planned.

Pupils with high functioning autism have specific needs associated with their autism that need to be understood and accommodated for. They are a group of pupils however that could and should have access to a mainstream curriculum and be allowed and enabled to access a mainstream environment.

- **Lack of residential provision within city**

There are currently 24 children who have a residential placement in an out of city independent special school. Out of these 24 children, two are in highly specialist provision and could not have their educational needs met locally. About seven need to be out of the city for their own safety due to their vulnerability socially and emotionally. Ten of the children could live at home if the right educational provision was available, leaving 5 children, with complex needs, who could be educated within the city if there was residential provision available.
• **Parental perceptions and preference**

A number of children are placed in out of city independent special schools due to parental preference following a tribunal. Whilst in many cases the local authority considers that suitable local provision is available parents are understandably drawn to some of the independent special schools that have an attractive and comprehensive offer that is well marketed. Visits to a number of these schools as part of this review has found them to be, on the whole, well run; with dedicated teaching and support staff; regular onsite access to therapeutic provision; good staff: pupil ratios; good facilities; a highly differentiated curriculum; access to staff with a range of qualifications to meet individual needs; and an environment that supports and adapts to meet the individual needs of every child and young person.

• **Marketing of offer**

The Review team have observed that independent special schools tend to have an attractive and comprehensive offer that is very well marketed. In some cases the school buildings look impressive set within their own grounds. It should not be too surprising if parents are drawn to this provision.

It is recommended that local provisions are similarly 'marketed' to highlight to parents the offer for the child and their family.

• **Availability of therapies**

Inspection of independent special school brochures and visits to a selection of schools shows that there is an offer of onsite access to therapeutic provision including in most cases speech and language therapy, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, psychology, psychiatry and in some cases play therapy, and art therapy. Although this provision may be shared across two or more schools (a fact that is not always explicit on websites or within school brochures) it is more readily available than provision to mainstream or special schools in Portsmouth. In fact children and young people are unable to access occupational therapy for sensory integration programmes due to sensory processing difficulties. Independent special schools tend to also offer other facilities and resources which are very alluring to children and families such as onsite or local horse-riding and swimming pools.

• **Multiple providers**

Children are placed in a wide range of independent special schools which reduces the negotiating power of individual Local Authorities. Contracting of residential
placements for social care and educational needs has been managed within The Hampshire Residential Framework. This Framework is due to expire in October 2018. Whilst there are plans in place to commission a new framework as a collaborative with Hampshire and Southampton, SEN residential placements will not be part of the new procurement. All three Authorities are keen to work together to develop a framework specifically for SEND and to negotiate more favourable contracts with a few local providers. Initial discussions have taken place to explore options.

- Early intervention and multi-agency decision making

The Strategic Review Team reviewed case histories of pupils in out of city provision and noted that these children experience repeated failure and issues with attachment are therefore often compounded. It is clear that many pupils, especially those with social, emotional and mental health issues, have a tough journey through most of their early and primary years which may exacerbate their difficulties, escalating as the transition to secondary school approaches, with special or out of city placement becoming almost inevitable. This comment has been made to the Review Team by professionals working across the city in Education and Social Care, recognising that difficulties with educational provision are often compounded by social and environmental factors in the life of the child concerned. The Fragile Cases Panel involving Education and Social Care is relatively new and as it develops it is hoped that it will have a positive impact on placement stability and provision.

Out of city provision is only usually considered when local options have been exhausted. The current process for placing a child in an out of city independent special school can be slow and time consuming with residential placements being agreed only when all other options have been exhausted and/or placements have broken down. Such delays have resulted in increased costs as finding appropriate placements becomes more urgent and reduces any negotiating power with independent providers. Parents explained to the Review Team that it is important to them "Not to let a child have to struggle so long before getting help".

- Age

The majority of pupils placed out of city are of secondary age (67%) with 27% being Post 16.

Primary schools, especially at key stage 1, have more flexibility to meet the needs of pupils with SEN and this may be particularly relevant for those with SEMH. Constraints with curriculum and assessment at key stage 3 and 4 are perceived to mitigate against inclusion of older pupils with SEN.
On closer scrutiny however, many of the children eventually placed out of city were identified in their early/primary years and received significant input from schools, specialist advisers, and health professionals. The majority had been excluded on a number of occasions and were on part time timetables. Many also had a number of school placements including periods at alternative provision and / or an SEMH special school.

Both out of city special schools and Portsmouth City special schools expressed a wish to have pupils placed at an earlier age to give them time to ‘turn the child around’, reduce the escalation of failure and distress experienced by these pupils and potentially enable them to return to mainstream education, although this rarely happens.

- **Commissioning and clarity of advice**

In order to promote good outcomes for children early intervention is essential. This concept is well understood but sometimes panels are required to make decisions before advice from professionals is available or may not have even been commissioned. Whilst this is rare for out of city placements, it is still important to ensure that advice is commissioned and provided in a timely manner. When it is provided it must be clear, specific, jargon free and reflect the voice of the child or young person concerned, to ensure this is never overlooked.

- **Duration of placement**

Once children and young people are placed out of city they rarely return even for post 16 provision. Pupils rarely move unless the placement has broken down or needs have changed. It could be argued that this is good practice in terms of maintaining the stability of a placement. However, each placement should therefore be considered within the context of the length of financial commitment that it is likely to entail. With the increase in statutory entitlement to 25 years, there is the potential that some pupils will continue within the provision up to that age. If 50% of students currently in out of city schools stay on until 25 years the additional cost to education in 2018 will be £60,494 increasing to an additional cost of £665,434 in 2022. The potential cost in 2022 could be in the region of £2,843,230.

- **Critical monitoring of pupil progress and challenge from the Local Authority**

There are several steps in place to ensure pupil progress is tracked and monitored.

SEND advisers attend annual review of EHC plans to ensure that pupils are making expected progress, plans are still appropriate and relevant, with needs and plans updated accordingly.
The SEND Team Manager keeps an overview of pupils in out of city placements by attending High Needs Panel, Inclusion Support Panel (ISP), Specialist ISP and Fragile Cases meetings. The SEND Team attend annual reviews in independent special schools. Over the past year the Annual Review process has included a plan that reflects the Preparing for Adulthood outcomes.

The virtual school team and Educational Psychology support children looked after in out of city provision.

The cost of placements is challenged by the SEND Team but there is a strong feeling that local authorities are held to ransom by independent out of city special schools because there is little option but to pay for additional costs when requested or risk the placement being ceased.

Whilst these processes are in place the critical monitoring of pupil progress and challenge to independent providers needs to be even more rigorous. New, statutory guidance was issued in November 2017\(^\text{18}\) outlining that pupils in residential settings must receive a visit from a suitably skilled and experienced representative of the accommodating local authority at intervals of not more than six months. Local authorities and other bodies must cooperate in their planning to support vulnerable children and young people, and in assessing their needs, commissioning and making appropriate provision. The views of the child or young person must be elicited. Further requirements are also included in the guidance.

**Potential savings and costs**

It is believed that many of the children who are currently in out of city placements could have had their needs met within the city if additional support and provision had been available. If the current numbers of children in out of city placements could be reduced by up to 75% significant savings to Portsmouth City Council would be made, impacting on the high needs block.

For example with an indicative average total cost per placement of £124,054 (education, social care, health and transport), the saving that could be achieved by reducing the number of out of city placements to 9 would be £3,349,458. With an indicative average cost to education per placement of £60,494, the savings would be £1,633,338.

With children settled in their current placements it is not envisaged that they will be returned to the city unless transition points are reached and it is deemed to be an appropriate move. The goal would be the reduction in out of city placements going forward. For illustrative purposes, based on the current placements out of city and assuming all pupils continued until the end of year 13, it would be 2028 before the

---

\(^\text{18}\) Statutory visits to children with special educational needs and disabilities or health conditions in long-term residential settings: statutory guidance for local authorities, health bodies and health or educational establishments. DFE and DoH. November 2017
youngest child (currently in year 3) left school. On the assumption that there will always be approximately 8-10 children in out of city placements the cost modelling below has been worked up to the point of the last 10 pupils (Table 10.1.2).

Table 10.1.2 - Potential reduction in cost of OOC provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year</th>
<th>The number of pupils in OOC provision</th>
<th>Costs to education based on £60,494 per pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>£2,177,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>£2,117,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>£2,056,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>£1,754,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£1,633,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£967,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£846,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£604,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Out of city placements could, in time, be significantly reduced with a subsequent reduction in expenditure. With investment in capital building, staffing numbers, therapy provision and resources, strengthening workforce skills and competencies, alongside an enhanced marketing of the local offer the majority of children and young people should be able to have their needs met within the city.

Recommendation 10.1.1: Pupils are identified earlier and clear protocols developed to enable decisions to be made quickly to allow pupils access to a school that can meet their needs. Focus on the identification of risk factors for social, educational breakdown and early intervention at first sign of breakdown to support child, family and school to maintain child in city linked to Early Help Processes, MATs and MASH.

Recommendation 10.1.2: A process is established for monitoring all children who are at risk of not having their needs met within the city and/or have been excluded from school. Designated SEND Officers are given responsibility for monitoring and tracking pupils to ensure that needs are properly identified and addressed early on, with the outcomes of external support monitored and specialist provision for those most vulnerable to poor outcomes considered as an option at the earliest point rather than as a last resort. Assessments and advice must be commissioned from appropriate services in a timely manner to ensure Panels can draw on high quality information for decision making purposes. Proactive anticipation of need is essential to guard against failed placement.
Recommendation 10.1.3: All children and young people in out of city schools are monitored and reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that placements are appropriate, value for money, delivering the interventions as detailed in each child's EHCP and achieving expected outcomes. The statutory guidance on visiting pupils in residential settings needs to be embedded in PCC practice.

Recommendation 10.1.4: Contracting framework for out of city placement to be developed. Contracting framework, in partnership with neighbouring authorities across the South East, with providers could provide guarantee of placements, set clear expectations of provision, reduce hidden or unforeseen costs, increase accountability in terms of outcomes and lead to a reduction in exclusions. Greater financial stability for out of city providers may be an incentive for collaboration.

Recommendation 10.1.5: Consideration to be given to increasing the capacity of the SEND Team to support the above recommendations

Recommendation 10.1.6: Over and above the Local Offer and the School SEN Report, clear guidance both written and available in person should be provided to parents to support their decision-making regarding suitable provision for their child. Local provisions to be 'marketed' to highlight to parents the offer and advantages for the child and their family.

Recommendation 10.1.7: Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and a specialist teacher (ASD) to be funded to support the communication, sensory, and functional needs of pupils with SEMH and ASD. It is suggested that this is developed as a peripatetic team, as part of the wider outreach offer. The specialist teacher could be attached to the Secondary Autism Inclusion Centre.

Recommendation 10.1.8: The review supports the establishment of the Free School for children with autism and challenging behaviour Whilst it is not the intention of the review to return children to Portsmouth from out of city there may be scope for working with the schools and parents of those pupils coming up to the end of an age phase to explore the potential for transitioning pupils back.

Recommendation 10.1.9: The review supports the current development of The Harbour School Vanguard Key Stage 4 provision in Cosham. Focussing on a vocational curriculum this provision will be better equipped to meet the needs and interests of the most vulnerable young people with the most challenging behaviour.

Recommendation 10.1.10: Develop local residential provision and respite for pupils with severe and complex needs/autism and challenging behaviour. Provide support for those children and young people whose needs have a significant impact on the family and / or for those who need 24hr wrap around provision. Consideration could be given to whether there is scope for this to be developed in partnership with Southampton and Hampshire.
10.2 Meeting the needs of the growing number of children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs, and associated pressure on special school places

The number of children and young people with severe learning disabilities, complex needs and life limiting conditions has increased. This has been highlighted nationally and reported by the Council for Disabled Children. In the past ten years, the prevalence of severe disability and complex needs has risen which cannot be explained by population increase alone. The increase is due to a number of other factors, including increased survival of pre-term babies and increased survival of children after severe trauma or illness. Children with life limiting conditions, such as cystic fibrosis have better life expectancy. The increase is predicted to continue. Research into the incidence and prevalence of PMLD suggests an annual increase of 4.8%.

With the increase in the age range of statutory protection it is anticipated that the numbers of young people aged 16+ with an EHCP will continue to grow requiring additional capacity in special schools for pupils with complex needs and a different more vocationally based offer.

The increase in prevalence of children and young people will increase the need for provision at special schools. In addition, improvements in the quality of special school provision, changing societal attitudes and the empowerment of parents to be more involved in decision making with regard to their children’s special educational needs, has led to an increase in demand for special school placement.

Parental preference is influenced by parental perception of special school provision and the advice from health colleagues and education staff. Attitudes towards special schools have changed over the last 10 years in line with the change in attitudes towards disability in general. Special Schools are now seen as centres of excellence with specialist knowledge and expertise, offering good to outstanding education in Portsmouth (confirmed by recent Ofsted Reports) and an environment that supports children and young people with SEND to thrive. They are sometimes seen as the only place where a child's needs can be met and as such are often endorsed by health practitioners and education staff from special and some mainstream schools. The Local Area Inspections: One Year On October 2017 report indicated that a large proportion of parents in the local areas inspected lacked confidence in the ability of mainstream schools to meet their child’s needs. Many parents of children or young people who have SEND reported concerns about the quality of staff training and teachers’ ability to meet their child’s specific needs when in mainstream school.

---

19 Understanding the needs of disabled children with complex needs or life-limiting conditions. Council for Disabled Children (2016)
22 Local Area SEND Inspections: One Year On. CQC Ofsted October 2017
Whilst parental knowledge and views are central to the formulation of their child's EHCP, parents have reported to the Review Team that they feel they lacked information to make informed choices and have been swayed by the advice given by professionals, some of which is contradictory. Many parents report not feeling listened to; some parents are advised that special school is the only option when they would like to explore mainstream alternatives and others that mainstream is the only option when parents have a strong preference for special school provision.

Anecdotal feedback indicates that the demand on special schools is to some extent based on the availability of places - the more places available, the more they will be filled. This is further evidenced by the variation in the numbers of children attending a special school across Southampton and Portsmouth, the South East Region and nationally (Figure 10.2) and special school Headteachers who have told the Review Team of (a small number of) pupils in their schools who could and should be educated within a mainstream environment with appropriate support.

**Figure 10.2 - % of children attending special schools in each Local Authority (England 2016)**

In response to the increasing severity and complexity of the pupils attending special schools, and the increase in need and demand, the capacity in Portsmouth special schools for children with complex needs was increased in 2017. The Willows Centre for Children was commissioned to provide 20 Year R places for pupils with complex learning needs and Clifفذdale and Mary Rose were commissioned for individual places as required above their agreed place number (APN). In addition admission criteria were amended to reflect the plan for more pupils with moderate learning difficulties to be educated in mainstream settings. To determine the future need for
Special School places a SEND pupil place planning exercise was undertaken in May 2016 which predicted an increase of 24 Special School places from 2017 - 2022. The methodology used was based on a constant percentage of pupils being identified as needing an EHCP (3.2%) and a constant percentage of pupils being educated in Special School.

However, despite undertaking a forecasting exercise and increasing capacity, the need and demand still outstrips the provision available.

The increasing number of secondary aged pupils in Portsmouth has impacted on the number of places becoming available for younger children in special schools for complex needs in recent years.

Mary Rose Academy has a 12 (part-time) place nursery for children with profound and multiple disabilities (PMLD). Currently 5 children attend. The places are part of the overall agreed place number (APN) and are not protected places. Places are not always available when need arises as the places are used for school aged children where no alternatives are available. This is frustrating for parents as some children miss the opportunity to attend the nursery altogether. Willows can meet need but some parents express a strong preference for Mary Rose Nursery due to the complexity of need of their children and the knowledge that they will require placement at Mary Rose Academy at school age.

As a result of the pressure on places at Cliffdale and Mary Rose special schools, Willows Centre for Children has for the third year running opened a Year R class for pupils who meet criteria either for Cliffdale or Mary Rose special schools. In September 2018 in addition to the 20 pupils attending a reception class at Willows there will be approximately 6 pupils attending a Year 1 class. It is anticipated that this level of need will continue. This has led to a reduction in the number of the SEND nursery places at Willows Nursery, commissioned by PCC.

While the capacity of special schools has increased there has been no matched increase in therapy provision. To ensure that the city’s special schools have an attractive offer there will need to be an increase in the therapy provision available.

The Early Years Panel meets monthly to ensure that by the time children who may have special educational needs start school they have been identified, assessed and provision put in place. The Panel tracks and monitors pupils but its capacity to forecast need has not been fully utilised. Improved forecasting of needs during the early years will support not only placement planning for special needs nursery provision and school reception year admissions but will allow predictions to be made for special school places throughout both primary and secondary phases and ultimately Post 16 provision. Regular monitoring of pupil needs, placements and moves will enable the LA to develop increasingly accurate predictions to inform future planning.
With the needs and demand increasing in the age groups at both ends of Special School provision, it is vital that accurate forecasting is undertaken, monitored and amended annually to ensure that the City's capacity matches need, and demand is appropriately managed.

From modelling of places needed based on current pupil numbers, population increases, changes in prevalence and expected parental preferences, it is predicted that between 125 and 180 additional places for children and young people with complex needs could be required over the next 5 years. (See Appendix 4 for details of complex needs place forecast modelling).

These figures are based on 2 different approaches to modelling future need. The figure of 180 (methodology 1) is based on population and predicted prevalence increases plus modelling the current cohorts of children through all the age phases. This modelling has taken into account the average numbers of children who transfer into and out of the schools, at and between typical transition points. It also increased Post 16 places within current special school provision and anticipates that as a consequence there will be a subsequent demand for Post 19 on site provision. Currently Mary Rose is the only special school with Post 16 provision. Both Mary Rose and Redwood Park schools have expressed interest in developing a Post 16 offer.

The additional 125 places, identified through methodology 2, is based on population and predicted prevalence increases applied to a starting point of the current APN and an acknowledgement that most Post 16 places will be managed within college provision along current lines. Within this modelling there has been no Post 19 provision factored in.

The size of the difference between the 2 figures is also in part due to the demand for special school places and in part due to the ability and willingness of mainstream schools to include pupils with more complex needs.

It is noted that capital funding for building works has recently been provided to Cliffdale and Redwood Park Schools to support the greater complexity of pupils needs but will not provide additional capacity. The works on Cliffdale have started and are due to be completed in February 2019. £2m has been allocated for the work on Redwood Park but a further £1m is still needed to ensure the works can go ahead (subject to an application to the Secretary of State to use Dedicated School Grant (DSG) carry forward as endorsed by the Schools Forum.

**Conclusion**

The numbers and complexity of children and young people with SEND is increasing with the potential for a significant increase in cost. Action is required to manage demand to ensure that future needs are met in a financially sustainable manner.
Recommendation 10.2.1: The Early Years Panel to be the central point for the collation of all data / intelligence on children 0 - school age with complex health, social care, educational needs.

Recommendation 10.2.2: The Early Years Panel to provide quarterly reports on numbers, age, type of need for forecasting purposes, which is shared with the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group and School Organisation Team.

Recommendation 10.2.3: SEND needs and placement planning to be included in the annual cycle of school placement planning undertaken by the School Organisation Team, supported by an annual refresh of the SEND needs assessment and reported to the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.

Recommendation 10.2.4: Consideration should be given to how best to meet the needs of pre-school children with SEND, options include:
- one nursery setting to provide special needs provision across Portsmouth with capacity and expertise to meet all needs
- protecting a number of nursery places at Mary Rose Academy for those children with the most profound needs who are clearly going to require an ongoing placement there
- more pre-school children supported in mainstream settings.

Recommendation 10.2.5: The criteria for Special School placement is clearly defined

Recommendation 10.2.6: The process for determining provision is clearly defined and communicated to all professionals involved. Reviewed annually, it is included in the induction of the workforce for SEND so that parents receive coherent information and advice

Recommendation 10.2.7: Additional provision for children with complex needs will be required, which may include additional capacity at special schools, inclusion centres and/or mainstream schools (See also recommendation 10.5.8: Consideration to be given to the development of a primary and secondary inclusion centre for pupils with learning difficulties to reduce pressure on special schools places. This may contribute to solutions about meeting need and demand bearing in mind capital funding pressure).

Recommendation 10.2.8: The level of therapy provision for children and young people with SEND to be reviewed to ensure needs are met and children are enabled to access the curriculum.
10.3 Reviewing the availability of post-16 provision for students with SEND, including for those with a sensory impairment

For many young people transition into adulthood is a rite of passage that can be exciting but also daunting at the same time. It is a time when peer relationships become important as the main sources of support during a period of increasing independence. The ability to communicate effectively, form friendships, manage on a daily basis (meeting functional and emotional needs) becomes key to the successful transition into a happy and healthy adult life.

For young people with SEND this transition can be an extremely challenging time.

In August 2012, the Ofsted survey ‘Progression post-16 for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities’ found that transition arrangements for these learners to post-16 education and into adulthood were not fully effective. Schools, local authorities and other agencies did not work together sufficiently well to ensure that learners were adequately prepared for transition between school and post-16 provision.

The recently published Ofsted report, Moving Forward, found that too many young people with learning difficulties and / or disabilities are poorly prepared for adult life.

The Children and Families Act 2014 recognised the ineffective arrangements between education, health and social care agencies in supporting young people to successfully transition from school to post-16 provision and adult life and extended statutory protections for education up to the age of 25 to try and address this.

Parents told the Review team that they are concerned about transitions in general but perhaps especially to Post 16 provision and preparation for adulthood.

“It’s a daunting process. This is your life now. What about college? What about independent living?”

In 2015/16, 95% of the Portsmouth KS4 cohort with a statement or EHCP was in Education, Employment or Training compared to a national average of 91%. In contrast 79% of students with SEN Support and 93% of those with no SEND were in Education, Employment or Training comparing less favourably than their national counterparts at 88% and 95% respectively (Figure 10.3).

23 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/progression-from-school-for-those-with-learning-difficulties-or-disabilities

24 Moving forward? How well the further education and skills sector is preparing young people with high needs for adult life. Ofsted March 2016
There is generally a good range of Post 16 provision within and on the outskirts of the city providing academic and vocational courses alongside functional life skills with investment made in the last five years to establish the SLD/PD provision at Portsmouth College and the SEMH provision at Highbury College (Arundel Centre). The quality of provision in general is good and is provided by dedicated staff with a high level of knowledge and expertise. The college staff with whom the Review Team met are signed up to "inclusion" and show willingness to meet the needs of students with SEND. Equipment, resources, specialised teaching areas are available to all students and in all cases community areas are accessible to all students. Post 16 providers are on the whole very clear as to their remit and work with students and families to support their transition into adulthood and adult services.

Post 16 providers felt confident in meeting the needs of students with a wide range and complexity of needs and have invested, to varying degrees, in training and support staff such as nursing and therapy staff, British Sign Language interpreters, specialist teachers, Emotional Literacy Support Assistants, autism ambassadors, specialist career advisers. The only students that they did not feel able to support were those requiring alternative feeding and very challenging behaviour. It is of note that College staff commented on the substantial mental health need that is not being met with cyber bullying and the negative aspects of social media being mentioned specifically.

Post 16 providers are willing and able to take students with a wide range of needs but find forward planning is impacted by delays in students confirming their placements. This is not uncommon for young people making the transition to college but can cause specific challenges when planning provision and resources for students with SEND. The recent changes to the EHCP format for pupils from 14
years onwards to align with the Preparing for Adulthood stages has helped professionals, parents and young people to think longer term about the skills that will be required for a successful transition. Whilst attendance at planning meetings is still dominated by staff from Education it is being increasingly recognised that input from Health, Housing and Social Care could be highly advantageous in planning and developing timely holistic packages of support (e.g. supported housing needs an 18 month lead time).

Post 16 college leaders report that the lack of capital funding available is a barrier to widening the offer for students with SEND.

The expectation of self-managed learning and fewer tutored hours (16 hours as opposed to 30 hours in school) is an issue reported by families and presents problems for young people requiring some level of support or supervision throughout the day. The option of a more structured and fully supported timetable with academic learning happening alongside the development of functional life skills would enable students to gain the skills required to have a meaningful adult life.

Support for young people who have not had an EHC plan but who have been at SEN Support level at school may need looking into.

With the extension of statutory responsibility for students with SEND up to the age of 25 years it is anticipated that the demand for post 19 provision will increase. An EHC will be required all the time that a young person is making educational progression and no longer. The Review Team were made aware that there can be differing views whether educational progression is being made within the context of lifelong learning. The drive to continue in education may be due to a perception that the offer from adult services is less attractive. This will require the Local Authority to consider how to respond and plan accordingly both in terms of the educational offer and adult provision.

The table below shows the significant increase in young people Post 16 with an EHC in 2016 and Post 19 in 2017 (Table 10.3.1). It is anticipated that these numbers will continue to increase (see Appendix 9).

| Table 10.3.1 - Number of pupils with statements/EHCPs by age |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| <5              | 32   | 25   | 30   | 29   | 30   | 37   |
| 5-10            | 395  | 414  | 418  | 418  | 417  | 482  |
| 11-15           | 396  | 402  | 427  | 444  | 464  | 496  |
| 16-19           | 53   | 53   | 54   | 64   | 120  | 232  |
| 20-25           | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 22   |
| Total           | 876  | 894  | 929  | 955  | 1032 | 1269 |

(Source: SEN2 Return)
Whilst there are currently 254 EHCPs in place only 107 are funded from the High Needs Block. This is because Post 16 providers review needs outlined in the Education, Health and Care plans in relation to the support and provision available in college, bearing in mind that students are on site for 16 hours as opposed to 30 hours at school, meaning that element three funding is not always required.

The reforms in 2014 required the transfer of statements in to EHCPs and few statements have been ceased during this period, as per DfE expectations. Whilst the majority of the increase in the numbers of EHCPs Post 16, as shown above, is due to the maintenance of plans, there has also been an increase in the number of new plans issued since 2016 (Table 10.3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10.3.2 - Number of new and discontinued statements/EHCPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New EHCPs 16-19yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1      0      0      2      4      1      14     11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New EHCPs 20-25yrs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0      0      0      0      0      1      1      2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discontinued EHCP Post 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103    100    80    95    80    6      2      4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Post-16 Forum regularly receives curriculum mapping updates from the Post 16 Commissioning Manager to identify gaps / areas of weakness in the Portsmouth Travel to Learn Area.

There are a number of young people with EHCPs who are not in education, employment or training (NEET). There is a risk this could increase due to a reduction in funding available to support re-engagement from July 2019. There is still currently insufficient re-engagement provision for this group and it is difficult to envisage under current Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) funding arrangements how this situation could improve.

There are a number of young people Post 16 in independent specialist out of city schools due to a historic lack of provision locally. The majority of young people placed in these schools stay beyond 16 and some even beyond 19.

There are four young people educated out of city, all with profound hearing loss. All were felt to require a peer group of young people with the same or similar needs. Potentially this group of young people could be provided for locally, drawing on the Council's Sensory Impairment Team and working with colleges to design high quality provision.
There are currently 3 Post-16 pupils with communication and interaction needs in out of city residential provision on the Isle of Wight and 3 Post-16 pupils with autism. All 6 pupils could be supported within the city if appropriate provision were to be made available such as specialist Speech and Language Therapy and a sensory integration service as recommended in 10.1.7.

Young people, some of whom are looked after, currently in residential SEMH provision, will eventually return to Portsmouth. They may not meet criteria for support from the Adult Social Care Learning Disabilities team but will have an EHC plan and special educational needs and will be vulnerable young adults. It is often confusing for this group in terms of knowing which department to contact and what support is available. Discussion with professionals regarding specific cases indicates that staff can feel lacking in skills and knowledge to support young people with complex SEMH needs.

Similarly, some young people who have high functioning autism do not meet the criteria for the Adult Social Care Learning Disabilities Team and are left feeling unsupported or return to require services later on.

Discussions with adult services to explore options for the development of packages of supported housing, daytime social and educational activities and work experience could provide innovative solutions to expensive external College placements, support transitions into adulthood and integration into local communities.

A recently unsuccessful transition bid, tabled under the Housing and Support Strategy, was proposing a joint development with Education to support young people with autism, SEMH and learning difficulties who need residential provision alongside their continued educational provision. Apart from the costs attached to residential college placements and the dislocation from place and family, local provision would support incremental and flexible progress into adult provision and so support transition.

It is felt that the majority of students can be educated in local Colleges. In spite of concerns outlined in the above cited Ofsted reports, local colleges are willing to make provision for Post 16 young people with complex needs. Done well, this should be a natural and positive step towards preparing for adulthood, offering new experiences and opportunities. There are a few students however whose needs are so complex or challenging that they may need specialist provision.

The Mary Rose Academy is the only special school within Portsmouth to take pupils beyond 16. It is anticipated that the need and demand for specialist Post 16 and potentially Post 19 provision will increase.
Conclusion

With the increase in age of statutory protection it is likely that the number of young people with an EHCP Post 16 will increase. In preparing young people for adulthood, consideration will need to be given to their specific needs with a range of provisions being made available. The local authority will need to work proactively with Post 16 providers and Special School Headteachers; Adult Social Care and young people to determine the nature of that provision to ensure needs are met in the future.

Recommendation: 10.3.1: PCC should continue to work with local post 16 providers to ensure sufficiency of high quality, inclusive educational provision for students with SEND. This is an opportunity for coproduction with young people and families

Recommendation 10.3.2: Building on the work of the Post-16 Forum, explore specific gaps in provision. For example, provision for pupils with hearing or/and visual impairment. This might also apply for physical disability, autism and support for re-engagement of young people with SEMH, in co-production with parents and young people. Explore opportunities for shared provision with Hampshire or/and Southampton/West Sussex.

Recommendation 10.3.3: Strengthen process for sharing information between Education SEND team, the School Organisation Team and Adult Social care teams on young people (14 years) with EHC plans for forecasting purposes and to begin the plan for individual young people transitioning to college with a real or virtual team, with clearly defined responsibilities taking a lead on this work.

Recommendation 10.3.4: Work with adult services to scope the costs and viability of developing supported housing and educational packages.

Recommendation 10.3.5: Social care Adult LD team and other teams in Adult Social Care to develop and roll-out a self-assessment tool for young people to clarify needs, develop clear pathways and access to provision. Closer liaison between all social care teams to support young people.

Recommendation 10.3.6: The Local Authority should work proactively with students, their families and independent out of city specialist providers in transitioning students back to the city for their Post 16 education.
10.4 Meeting the needs of the growing number of children and young people with autism/social communication needs and associated sensory processing difficulties and challenging behaviour

"The great increase in the number of children whose primary need is ASD is the clearest trend in the education data, evident in both mainstream and special school cohorts." Council for Disabled Children 2016

It has been well reported both in the literature and anecdotally that the prevalence of children and young people with ASD has been increasing year on year. It is therefore imperative that future support, management and provision for these pupils is identified and planned.

Since 2013 the number of pupils in Portsmouth with autism as their primary need has increased from 184 to 260, an increase of 41%. The latest prevalence studies suggest that 1.1% of the population may be on the autism spectrum. With a school aged population of 28,581, the current prevalence in Portsmouth is 0.9%. The numbers of children identified in Portsmouth is lower than the average for England.

The reasons for the increase in prevalence are not entirely clear. When asked whether the increase is a true increase in incidence, an increase in awareness, an increase in diagnosis, an increase in breadth of definition or increase in the age range of educational responsibility, most professionals respond that all above factors are relevant. The higher profile of autism in the media has resulted in a better understanding of the condition and greater social acceptance. Parents may be pursuing a diagnosis to understand and explain behaviours that they are struggling to manage. Further research into the possible genetic basis of autism will help increase our understanding of prevalence rates.

The (incorrect) belief that an EHCP will only be considered for autism if there is a diagnosis has put strain on health and education services. For example, one parent of a child with high functioning autism informed the Review Team that:

"EHCPs appear to be the magic ticket to services and support"

Whilst the development of the diagnostic pathway has streamlined processes and increased the numbers being diagnosed each year it is often mistakenly interpreted as equating to need. Whilst diagnostic criteria are applied, the diagnosis is based on verbal report and observable behaviour and it has been suggested to the Review Team that this can lead to some subjective interpretation. Many health and education professionals working currently in Portsmouth, who were consulted during
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the course of the review, appreciate that a diagnosis can be helpful but question its value as opposed to the consideration of a child's needs.

Portsmouth is a "needs led city" and professionals must focus on a functional assessment to meet needs rather than diagnosis. This needs to be embedded in policy and practice across the SEND 0-25 workforce.

Whilst it is difficult to predict whether this increase will continue it is generally believed by most professionals, pending new research, that the numbers being diagnosed will increase to at least the expected prevalence rates, then start to plateau. This may correlate with schools and practitioners becoming more confident in their knowledge and expertise in managing children with autism.

Interestingly some practitioners are starting to question whether some of the children presenting with social communication difficulties are presenting with an attachment disorder. It will be interesting to note if any growth in rates of attachment disorder coincide with a reduction in diagnoses of autism.

Despite these predictions and the greater understanding of autism there is still some way to go in ensuring that all provisions are meeting the needs of children and young people with autism, social communication disorders and associated sensory processing difficulties and challenging behaviour.

National statistics suggest that between 44-52% of people with autism have a learning disability. Within Portsmouth the majority of pupils with autism are currently being educated in a special school (52%). With smaller class sizes, specialised teaching approaches and the specialist knowledge of teaching staff, these pupils' needs are well met to the end of KS4.

The increasing pressure on Special School places and high numbers of pupils presenting with autism was the driver for the successful bid for a new special free school for children and young people with autism. This development will be a valuable addition to the city's provision and alleviate the concerns of many parents.

As a new specialist provision this school will be able to meet the needs of pupils with social communication needs, autism and challenging behaviours some of whom are currently in the out of city schools. This will relieve some of the pressure on the special schools and provide an environment specifically suited to the needs of pupils with autism. The provision of therapeutic input at the school will need to be commissioned (Speech & Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, psychology and psychiatry) to ensure that pupils' therapeutic needs are addressed to enable them to access education, develop functional life skills and to avoid expensive tribunals.

48-56% of people with autism do not have a learning disability. These pupils with high functioning autism have specific needs associated with their autism that need to be understood and accommodated for. They are frequently cited as being a group
where there is a gap in provision. They are a group of pupils however that could and
should have access to a mainstream curriculum and be allowed and enabled to
access a mainstream environment. Expert and comprehensive outreach support will
be required to support this.

Within Portsmouth 28% (73) of pupils with a primary need of autism are being
educated in a primary school and 20% (53) in a secondary school. Whilst the
majority of school staff and parents report a degree of confidence in managing the
needs of primary aged children with autism, it is at secondary level that concerns are
often raised. The more limited flexibility in curriculum delivery, frequent transitions,
size of school and the bewildering number of relationships and interactions to
navigate during the school day can make secondary school a difficult proposition for
many young people with social communication difficulties or autism.

Up to 80% of children and young people with autism experience sensory issues. The
report, Local Area SEND Inspections: One Year on - October 2017\(^{26}\) highlighted that
‘access to therapy services was a weakness in half of the local areas that had thus
far been inspected’. Typically, therapy services were of high quality but children and
young people experienced long waiting times as well as limited contact with the
therapists that they needed. In addition, ‘access to child and adolescent mental
health services (CAMHS) was poor in over a third of local areas’. Many parents
reported that the threshold to access CAMHS services was too high or waiting times
too long. It is recommended that a new peripatetic (SLT and teacher) team and
sensory integration service be established to support children and young people,
advise on environmental issues and equipment and support schools to become
autism friendly.

In line with the Portsmouth Autism Strategy's aims to become an autism friendly city
it is recommended that all schools adopt autism friendly practices supported by
‘autism champions’ in each school, develop an autism friendly environment and
ensure that all staff are aware of and understand how to support pupils who are on
the autism spectrum. As a whole school approach many of the strategies and
interventions used to support pupils with autism will also support many other pupils
who for a variety of other reasons can find school a challenging place to be.

There are currently nine pupils with autism in independent specialist out of city
schools. The reasons for their placement out of city vary but include the need for
residential provision and input for sensory processing issues. It is anticipated that
this number could increase with the increase in age of statutory protection.

\(^{26}\) Local Area SEND Inspections: One year on. CQC Ofsted October 2017
Conclusion

The numbers of children with autism has been increasing year on year. Whilst it is likely that this increase will continue for the next few years, the review team believe that it will eventually plateau with the increasing understanding of neurodiversity.

Recommendation 10.4.1: All mainstream schools to have an identified Autism Champion to support the development of an autism friendly environment, autism friendly practice and individualised support to pupils on the autism spectrum. This staff member may not hold a qualification relating to ASC but will attend regular training sessions, have experience of working with pupils "on the spectrum" and be able to influence policy and practice in the setting.

Recommendation 10.4.2: Workforce development in special and mainstream schools to support children and young people with high functioning autism. Development of "Autism champions" programme to ensure high quality provision is in place and that provision is "tribunal proof" (i.e. to prevent PCC being directed to provide out of city placement by SENDIST when PCC feels confident that local provision is/should be an effective and efficient use of resources)

Recommendation 10.4.3: All special provision to have an ASC specialist (including SEMH provision)

Recommendation 10.4.4: Criteria for admission to the new special free school for children and young people with autism to be determined and factored into the strategic plans for future provision.

Recommendation as for 10.1.7: Speech and Language Therapy and Occupational Therapy, and a specialist teacher (ASD) to be funded to support the communication, sensory, and functional needs of pupils with SEMH and ASD. It is suggested that this is developed as a peripatetic team, as part of the wider outreach offer. The specialist teacher could be attached to the Secondary Autism Inclusion Centre
### 10.5 Reviewing the use of inclusion centres

Inclusion centres are “additionally funded” places within a mainstream school which are able to offer:

- Teaching staff with additional knowledge, skills and expertise in a particular area of SEND
- Specialist environments, which support the learning needs of each pupil
- Systems to track small-step progress
- Lessons in mainstream classes, but with additional specialist resources and teaching
- Additional Educational Psychologist and specialist health input as necessary.

Inclusion centres offer pupils the opportunity to be part of a mainstream environment whilst also receiving the support and specialist teaching that is available at a special school.

Inclusion Centres generally specialise in a particular area of special educational needs such as communication and interaction (CI), sensory impairment (SI) or autism spectrum disorder (ASD), although increasingly children may present with more than one area of need. Inclusion Centres are an integral part of the school and are small-scale. The precise organisation of inclusion centres varies but in general terms pupils will spend time within the designated Inclusion Centre classroom and access mainstream classes or subject lessons with individualised programmes of support. This approach enables each individual to receive the particular support that they need, at the appropriate age-related level in the most appropriate setting. In Portsmouth pupils in inclusion centres are on the mainstream school roll and are included within the school's data returns to the city council and DfE.

Young people whom we met as part of the Strategic Review expressed a range of views about the types of SEND provision available in Portsmouth and inclusion centres were regarded positively (Appendix 2).

Inclusion Centres are positively regarded by parents. The POET survey July 2017\(^\text{27}\) showed that parents felt that Inclusion Centres helped improve outcomes for their children. Inclusion Centres came out best where the outcomes related to community participation, friendships, activities & relaxation and future preparation.

The expectation in Portsmouth is that pupils attending inclusion centres will be enabled to spend time within the mainstream school environment and the intention is
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\(^{27}\) Analysis of Personal Outcomes Evaluation Tool (POET©) survey returns from a survey conducted in June/July 2017 with Parents and Children who have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) POET/SEND/SURVEY/ANALYSIS/AUGUST 2017. Fowkes M. IPC Programme Portsmouth
that they either transfer completely to the mainstream roll of the school or move to their local mainstream school in time. It is common, however, for pupils to remain on roll within the inclusion centre until the next transition point to a new school arises. Parents are often not keen for their children to leave an inclusion centre even despite progress. Paradoxically, this can result in a cohort whose needs are not as great as other pupils who are being supported wholly within mainstream.

Clarity is required around the purpose of inclusion centres, with new entry and exit criteria developed and applied consistently within the context of the overall provisions within the city. Managing the expectations of professionals and parents is key to the successful transition of pupils out of inclusion centres, when the time is right. Decisions made about placements are best made by a specialist Inclusion Support Panel involving a range of professionals and including staff from the Inclusion Settings.

Portsmouth currently has 9 Inclusion Centres. Two cater for pupils with speech, language and communication needs at key stage 1 and primary respectively; two cater for pupils with communication and interaction needs, also at key stage1 and primary; two cater for pupils with autism at primary and secondary level and two cater for sensory impairment, also at primary and secondary level. There is also provision for pupils with social, emotional and mental health needs at primary level. All 9 are managed by the schools in which they are hosted.

All but two inclusion centres are in primary schools. Parents of children with SEND report a degree of confidence that their child's needs are met in primary schools and in inclusion centres attached to primary schools. Whilst pupils in inclusion centres may have made sufficient progress to manage in mainstream secondary provision, parents, and sometimes, primary school SENCOs and class teachers are fearful of how children will cope at secondary level. For example one parent told the Review Team:-

"My child would not last a week in secondary school"

Support to pupils at secondary level is still regarded by parents as limited and patchy.

The two provisions at Devonshire Infant and Portsdown Primary schools have recently been re-designated for children with communication and interaction difficulties to cater for the increasing number of children presenting with social communication difficulties.
Portsmouth has a high number of pupils with speech, language and communication needs (SLCN). Pupils with SLCN are supported by two Language Inclusion Centres at Southsea Infants School and Victory Primary School. There is no secondary Language Inclusion Centre. Five pupils are currently in out of city independent special schools for pupils with SLCN at a combined cost to education of £211,706 (March 2018 costs). It is recommended that provision for secondary aged pupils with SLCN is established. This could be a secondary inclusion centre or a peripatetic team consisting of a specialist teacher and speech and language therapist.

Those schools with Language Inclusion Centres reported that their pupils' needs have changed over time with more having learning difficulties and/or communication and interaction difficulties with some associated challenging behaviour. This was reflected in the new criteria and service specification.

Milton Park Primary and Trafalgar Secondary school have inclusion centres for pupils with autism. The model of provision within each centre is significantly different, with the pupils in the primary provision being wholly educated within the centre and pupils in the secondary provision being wholly educated within their mainstream classes. As a result primary pupils transferring to the secondary inclusion centre are not well prepared for the demands that they will encounter. It is recommended that primary and secondary provision for the same needs is aligned.

Following a review of practice commissioned from the Teaching School Alliance, the primary inclusion centre at Milton Park Primary has a detailed action plan to support the development of high quality graduated provision. The Review team consider that the secondary autism inclusion centre, which is currently managed by a higher level teaching assistant, would benefit from having a qualified teacher to provide a more flexible approach for pupils who cannot access mainstream immediately or who require some teaching support within the inclusion centre base during their school career. This will have funding implications.

There is limited therapy support in the inclusion centres which can mitigate against their aim of providing short term specialist intervention to enable children to access a mainstream curriculum. The development of a peripatetic team to work alongside NHS staff could support all schools and individual pupils where required.

Similarly, mainstream schools and inclusion centres cannot access the CAMHS Learning Disability Team, though special schools can. This is an anomaly in a city that is "inclusive".

Inclusion centre staff reported feeling isolated and not part of a continuum of provision. The expression "out on a limb" was used to describe this feeling to the Review Team. Whilst Portsmouth City Council have provided staff training via the Educational Psychology Team and PSESP, staff reported finding it difficult to
access training and supervision which is pertinent to the issue of the changing needs of pupils and challenging behaviour.

It has been reported to the Review Team by head teachers hosting Inclusion Centres that there is an economy of scale with regard to provision and numbers of 8 pupils plus is much more viable.

With increasing numbers of pupils with complex needs requiring specialist provision, it is vital that those pupils who could be supported within a mainstream environment have their needs identified with support provided accordingly. One alternative to creating more provision in special schools for children with complex need is to consider the development of a primary and secondary inclusion centre for children with cognition and learning difficulties who need additional support for their learning but could manage, socially and emotionally, within a mainstream environment. This model has been successfully trialled in Southampton and has now been made permanent. It is interesting to note that in Southampton the inclusion centres are linked to and managed by the primary special school for children with complex needs. The intention is not to integrate the pupils into mainstream in the longer term and it is understood the pupils will require special school provision at secondary school.

**Conclusion**

Inclusion Centres provide a valuable offer, are popular with parents and children and young people and promote the "inclusion agenda" supporting those pupils who have significant special educational needs but who can nonetheless thrive in a mainstream setting. Pupils should have the opportunity to spend time in the mainstream of the host school (with support) based on individual need as specified on the child's EHCP. What is essential to achieve successful outcomes is that the pupils feel happy, safe, respected and have a sense of belonging in their school community irrespective of the number of lessons in mainstream classrooms.

**Recommendation 10.5.1:** Placements at inclusion centres to be proactively managed with more active movement into and out of the centres to ensure that all provisions are supporting the pupils with the greatest need. All pupils should be reviewed at the end of each key stage to assess on-going suitability of provision. Decisions relating to placement should be made at the specialist inclusion support panels by a range of professionals including the staff in charge of the inclusion centres.
Recommendation 10.5.2: Clear entry and exit criteria need to be refreshed for the Language Inclusion Centre and Communication and Interaction Centres and applied consistently within the context of the overall provisions within the city. Consideration to be given to applying the same criteria for the Language Inclusion Centres as the Communication and Interaction Centres as the same approaches and strategies are used in these settings for pupils with similar needs.

Recommendation 10.5.3: All Inclusion Centres to offer a graduated provision of withdrawal and integration according to each child's needs. Primary and Secondary Inclusion Centres supporting the same needs must work collaboratively to prepare pupils for effective transitions.

Recommendation 10.5.4: All inclusion centres to have a specialist qualified teacher to support pupils' educational needs within both the classroom and the centre and to contribute to the offer of outreach support to local mainstream schools.

Recommendation 10.5.5: Inclusion Centres (and mainstream schools) must be able to access CAMHs LD team

Recommendation 10.5.6: A network for Inclusion Centres to be developed to encourage the sharing of good practice, support continuing professional development and offer supervision with support from PCC Inclusion Service and the Portsmouth Teaching School Alliance.

Recommendation 10.5.7: Consideration to be given to the development of a primary and secondary inclusion centre for pupils with learning difficulties to reduce pressure on special schools places. This may contribute to solutions about meeting need and demand, bearing in mind capital funding pressures.

Recommendation 10.5.8: Consideration to be given to the level of therapy provision to pupils in inclusion centres to ensure that all the child's needs are addressed and access to a mainstream environment and curriculum is enabled.
10.6 Reviewing the identification of SEND and thresholds for requesting EHCP needs assessments

Having remained at 3.1% of the population for several years, the percentage of children and young people with a statement or EHCP has increased this year to 3.3%. The national average is 2.8%. The number of assessments has doubled in three years (Figure 10.6).

![Figure 10.6 - Increase in SEN Statutory Assessments](image)

Apart from a rise in population and incidence of special educational needs, there are a number of other reasons that may account for this fact:

- The Code of Practice recommends a graduated approach to assessing and reviewing needs and progress before requesting an EHC assessment but the law allows for an assessment to proceed if there is any doubt of SEN. This makes it more difficult not to agree to a request for assessment.
- There is a perception among schools that funding for special educational needs is inadequate. Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs) have commented that EHCPs are seen as a means to ensure funding is targeted at pupils who need support. However the unintended adverse consequence is that it becomes increasingly challenging to meet needs for pupils on SEN Support.
- SENCOs may make a request on behalf of a parent in order to be seen as supportive to the parent or to prevent damage to relationships, even when they do not think it is necessary.
- Tribunals are not seen by Local Authorities to support them in refusal to assess.
- The Children and Families Act extended the age range resulting in a need to fund educational provision up to the age of 25 years.

Professionals may be quite clear that needs can often be met without an EHCP. However, parents believe that there are numerous advantages to having an EHCP.
One parent wrote to the Review team about EHCPs:

"Professionals seem appalled that parents should… work so hard to get an EHCP for their child. But without an EHCP the parents DO NOT get the support for their child. Example - you do not get to choose an appropriate school for your child unless you have an EHCP, you just have to go in the pot with hundreds of other kids in the city. You do not get access to support such as Supported Internships unless you have an EHCP. You do not attract funding into the school unless you have an EHCP. You do not have anything in writing to back up what you require from the school to be done for your child unless you have an EHCP. The schools tell you that they don’t have the resource to pay for additional help for your child and you seem to have no way to enforce it. Can you see why it is so essential to fight for an EHCP?"

The EHCP process, which was reduced from 26 to 20 weeks, is still long, complicated and costly in terms of time and staffing capacity.

In Portsmouth the Inclusion Service is starting to analyse requests for EHC assessments in depth in order to understand differences in practice (such as whether EHC requests increase at points of transition) or differences in the numbers of requests from settings to target the offer of support or guidance which is accessible through the Strategic School Improvement Fund.

The Portsmouth Education Partnership (PEP) has secured funding from the national Strategic School Improvement Fund (SSIF). The project focuses on improving outcomes for disadvantaged children and young people and will be delivered through the Challenge the Gap Programme, led by the Portsmouth Teaching School Alliance. £200,000 was secured to support 18 schools in the city (3 clusters). A bid has recently submitted under Round 2 of the SSIF which focuses on improving the outcomes of children and young people in mainstream schools who are on SEN Support.

With the High Needs Block being overspent the Local Authority is exploring a number of ways of managing demand that offer financially sustainable solutions such as:

- Reviewing thresholds for EHCPs and decision making
- Working with schools and finance teams to review models of funding from the Element 3 part of the budget
- More effective use of outreach to maintain children and young people at SEN Support level of the Code of Practice
- Working directly with SENCOs to support practice
There is a graduated approach to supporting children and young people with SEND who require additional provision. In Portsmouth this is set out in the ordinarily available provision (OAP) guidance which has recently been revised in conjunction with SENCOs and the Inclusion Service. This guidance makes clear the provision that mainstream schools in the city have agreed should be available for their pupils with SEND. It is expected that this provision is used before an EHC request is made and will ensure that only those children and young people with the most severe, long term or complex needs have an EHCP. OAP is funded through the schools notional SEN budget.

The revised OAP guidance document has been sent to all Portsmouth schools and will be discussed regularly with SENCOs and at the SENCO network.

Some Local Authorities, including Southampton, are beginning to pilot processes to target additional funding to pupils without going through the EHC assessment process. In Southampton the pilot scheme will focus on pupils who are preparing for transition to secondary school. There are arguments for and against this approach. It may streamline processes or it may add another layer of bureaucracy. Parents would have to have full confidence in the process for it to work instead of the EHC assessment process. These developments are being monitored and if early signs from other LAs are promising then further work exploring how Portsmouth could implement these processes should be considered.

**Conclusion**

The review team anticipate that the number of EHCPs will begin to plateau at 3.3% and potentially could return to 3.1%.

**Recommendation 10.6.1:** It is recommended that SENCOs, Head Teachers and colleagues in other agencies understand funding mechanisms and the pressures on the High Needs Block and apply the best evidenced based approaches to support children and young people. Supervision (including peer supervision) is also essential to ensure that SENCOs feel confident and competent with local processes relating to the Code of Practice and working with parents. These steps should help to ensure Education, Health and Care assessment requests are made for pupils with severe, long term, complex needs.
10.7 Inclusion

The aim of the SEND strategy in Portsmouth is to promote inclusion and improve the outcomes for Portsmouth children and young people aged 0-25 years with SEND and their families. The strategy is Priority 4 of the Childrens Trust Plan. The Inclusion Group, which reports into Portsmouth Education Partnership and the SEND Reforms Implementation and Performance Group, has a remit to focus on emotional health and wellbeing and to removing barriers to inclusion.

The Review Team were not tasked to investigate "inclusion" but every aspect of the Review involved some reference to inclusion or inclusive practice and it became clear that the term meant different things to different people.

When the Review Team asked what makes an inclusive school most respondents found it difficult to define. What became clear through visits to schools and discussions with Head teachers and SENCOs is that true inclusion is more about attitudes than policies and procedures - a feeling rather than a place (see Appendix 5 for a list of features seen by the Review Team in highly inclusive schools)

Dynamite, the Young People Group representing and advocating for children and young people in Portsmouth with SEND have also investigated the meaning of inclusion (see Appendix 6).

Professionals attending Portsmouth Inclusion Conference in October 2017 were invited to comment on what inclusion meant to them and the factors that supported successful inclusive practices or put barriers in the way of it (Appendix 7).

Being such a central aspect of the SEND Strategy it is important that parents, professionals and educational settings share an understanding of what inclusion means and schools are encouraged to adopt the attitudes and practices of the best inclusive schools. This is being actively pursued through the Inclusion Group which reports to the SEND Board and the Portsmouth Education Partnership.

Schools across Portsmouth vary in their levels of inclusivity. Whilst the majority of schools would wish to support inclusion all report the challenges of being an inclusive school such as:

- Impact on results and league rankings
- Impact on other pupils in the school
- Pressure on budget due to the additional costs of supporting high numbers of pupils with SEND
- Challenge of differentiating the curriculum to meet a wide range of needs and levels
- Social care issues that are often associated with SEND
- Ensuring staff have the knowledge and skills to meet a wide range of needs
- Safety of staff and pupils
Research has shown that attainment of pupils is largely independent of levels of inclusivity in schools. Overall attainment in local authorities with higher levels of inclusivity is similar to those with lower levels of inclusivity.

Those schools that are highly inclusive have Headteachers that believe strongly in the ethos of inclusion, see problems as challenges to be overcome and provide a highly child centred educational offer.

Evidence from the London Leadership Strategy has shown that purposeful and focussed collaboration between schools can improve outcomes for all pupils. The resulting SEN Review Guide has been developed and the Portsmouth Teaching School Alliance has successfully bid to the Strategic School Improvement Fund on behalf of the Portsmouth Education Partnership to establish a city wide programme of support to improve outcomes for pupils on SEN Support in mainstream schools using the SEN Review Guide as a basis for the programme.

With pressure on special school places and recognition that some pupils in special schools could be supported in a mainstream environment, it is recommended that all mainstream schools are encouraged and supported to embrace inclusion, sharing the 'load' and managing the demand and needs as a city wide responsibility.

To support inclusion schools need access to a robust and comprehensive outreach offer. This offer should:

- provide flexible, needs led support, advice, resources and modelling
- be provided by credible experts with current experience, including mainstream i.e. primary staff supporting primary schools, secondary staff supporting secondary schools
- be outcome focussed and centrally monitored to ensure that outcomes are achieved and value for money provided, linked to an alert system for pupils and schools who are struggling even with additional support
- be centrally managed and able to offer co-ordinated and graduated support bringing together education, health and social care
- be proactive, engaging early to achieve quick turnaround
- be part of a wider strategy of learning and development whereby the capacity and capability of the city to support pupils and understand what works is continually being developed
- be accountable and measurable

Portsmouth Special Educational Needs Support Partnership (PSENSP) is commissioned to provide outreach to primary and secondary schools across the city. Managed through the Teaching School Alliance, specialist advice is provided by the
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28 Inclusion and Pupil Achievement, Dyson et al. A research report for the DfES 2004
Special Schools within the city on request. Portsmouth Multi-agency Behaviour Support Service provides outreach as part of PSENSP and also as a traded service.

The current contract is due for renewal in September 2019. Anecdotal feedback from mainstream schools and evidence seen by the Review Team indicate that the Outreach Service currently provided is not fully meeting need or providing value for money with regard to the quality and depth of advice and support being offered. Only in 4 cases did a secondary school request support from PSENSP in the academic year 2016/17 in spite of the significant concerns expressed by parents and primary schools about the transition to secondary school.

There is a need to review PSENSP and have in place new arrangements in time for September 2019. The continued development of a robust Outreach Service to support schools training and development needs, provide modelling of good practice and specific interventions where required would do much to grow the overall capability of the city.

It is recommended that the new Outreach service includes additional therapy provision working alongside specialist teachers to support pupils with speech, language and communication needs and sensory processing difficulties (see recommendation 10.1.7). This proposal is modelled on the existing highly successful Hampshire Communication and Language Team who are well regarded by schools and Hampshire County Council and have as a result grown in size and reach. A peripatetic team could provide support to primary and secondary mainstream schools, interventions for specific pupils and support transition from primary school. It is believed that this would help to "tribunal proof" Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth NHS Clinical Commissioning Group.

Advice and support is also available from a range of sources within the Local Authority, the Sensory Impairment Team, Portage, Educational Psychology Team, specialist provisions, health and social care colleagues. It is essential that interventions are co-ordinated and not duplicated to maximise efficiency and effectiveness.

Many mainstream schools provide additional support to groups of pupils with SEND from within their own resources, purchasing additional specialist input e.g. Speech and Language Therapy as required. As a result a number have developed a level of expertise within particular areas. The ELSA programme (Emotional Literacy Support Assistant) is well established and the nurture group network is also gaining momentum. Schools are also increasingly and successfully developing their own alternative provision. This is particularly relevant for pupils with SEMH or who are vulnerable or anxious and who would benefit from the support of their local school and community.
Conclusion

Given the increasing demands on special schools to support children with increasingly complex needs, it will become vital that all mainstream schools are able to support a wider range of pupils.

**Recommendation 10.7.1:** A definition of inclusion to be co-produced with parents, children and young people and professionals across the city

**Recommendation 10.7.2:** Inclusive practice to be celebrated and supported with appropriate support and challenge made to settings to ensure a consistent approach and ethos is developed city wide. A kite mark of inclusion to be established based on 'What makes good inclusion' / Inclusion Audit

**Recommendation 10.7.3:** Ways of incentivising inclusion to be explored. This could include a 'seed' fund for mainstream schools to provide a financial contribution to schools wishing to develop a more inclusive offer

**Recommendation 10.7.4:** Ordinarily available provision needs to be reviewed and updated regularly with SENCOs to ensure consistency of approach and expectations

**Recommendation 10.7.5:** Portsmouth is a "needs led city" and professionals must focus on a functional assessment to meet needs rather than diagnosis. This needs to be embedded in policy and practice across the SEND 0-25 workforce

**Recommendation 10.7.6:** Schools Therapy Pack to be used as a universal resource to enable all pupils to achieve, augmented by access to consultation with Occupational Therapy, Speech and Language Therapy and Physiotherapy for targeted pupils.

**Recommendation 10.7.7:** All schools to be encouraged to develop their own provisions to meet the increasing number of pupils in mainstream with SEND

**Recommendation 10.7.8:** The current Outreach provision should be reviewed with new outreach arrangements in place for September 2019. A clear, transparent, consistent and quality assured offer of Outreach Support should be readily available for mainstream schools, delivered by primary and secondary specialists, designed to support individual pupils and build capacity in schools. This could be linked to the development of a peripatetic team (see 10.1.7) and possibly target SEMH and ASC with a focus on increasing uptake from secondary schools in particular
11 Forecasting future need

It is extremely difficult to accurately predict future need due to the number of factors and unknown variables that can have an effect. For SEND even trying to decide on the population to be used can be problematic (e.g. 0-25; 0-19; 5-19yrs) and depending upon the source can be significantly different. However having some idea of future need is vital in planning appropriate provisions some of which will require a significant lead in time to secure funding and then undertake the capital scheme (3-4 years).

Understanding the factors involved, having access to comparative data both locally and nationally, and using a robust and replicable methodology will allow reasonable predictions to be made that with annual reviews and analysis will ensure that degrees of accuracy and understanding will improve year on year.

In determining future need as part of the Strategic Review, the team consulted at length with the data teams from both Cities and as far as possible used their statistics and methodologies. In both cities the data teams were willing to share their knowledge and expertise and to actively contribute on a regular basis to discussions on population changes.

Forecasting to date has been largely based on an analysis of historical trends and predicted population changes, with the assumption that trends will continue and the prevalence of SEND will increase or decrease in line with the population.

These approaches are now deemed to be too simplistic. With no consideration of factors such as changes in prevalence, need or demand the forecasts have tended to fall significantly short of the number of places required resulting in last minute reactive placement of children and dissatisfied parents.

While trend data can be informative it can also be misleading being based on historical starting points, demand as well as prevalence. Taking factors, such as those below, into consideration will provide a more accurate and informed prediction.

Ongoing analysis of actual numbers compared to forecasts, combined with intelligence provided by SEND leaders in the city, will then start to improve the accuracy of the predictions year on year.

Recommendation 11.1: PCC to review the methodology and approach to forecasting to make it more robust and accurate notwithstanding the challenges involved in SEND forecasting. Data teams to be proactively involved, working alongside SEND Teams and LA Leaders, including the School Organisation Team, using hard data and soft intelligence to forecast, using the same methodology, to allow for year on year direct comparisons of change and continual
improvement in accuracy to inform future planning. This should link with the Needs Assessment and report into the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.

In determining future need a number of factors need to be considered, including:

- Population changes
- Changes across age groups
- Changes in prevalence
- Improvements in awareness, identification and classification
- Changes in primary and secondary needs
- The impact of increasing statutory protection to 25 years
- Parental preference
- Changes in societal attitudes
- Changes in curriculum / educational practice / health / social care practice/funding

### Population changes

The 0-19 population in Portsmouth in 2017 was 49,949 (Source: Hants SAPF 2016)

The overall population of Portsmouth has increased over the last 5 years mainly due to increases in housing and is expected to continue to grow over the next 5 years. As a percentage of the total population it is likely therefore that the number of children and young people with SEND will increase also.

The 0-19 population is expected to increase slightly year on year with a cumulative increase of 2.6% over the next 5 years (Table 11.1).

#### Table 11.1 - Predicted change in Portsmouth 0-19 population 2017-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Portsmouth 0-19 population</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 January</td>
<td>49,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 forecast</td>
<td>49,951</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 forecast</td>
<td>50,125</td>
<td>+0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 forecast</td>
<td>50,429</td>
<td>+0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 forecast</td>
<td>50,815</td>
<td>+0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 forecast</td>
<td>51,244</td>
<td>+0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change 2017-2022</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: HCC SAPF 2016)
The Portsmouth City schools population YR-Y11 is expected to increase by 12.5% by 2022 (Table 11.2). The figures below start with the 2017 January Census school population and are then increased in line with the SCAP 17 mainstream NCYR-11 forecast (Schools Capacity and Forecasting Task 2017).

Table 11.2 - Predicted change in Portsmouth school age population 2017-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>YR-Y11 population</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 January</td>
<td>28,581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 forecast</td>
<td>29,381</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 forecast</td>
<td>30,174</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 forecast</td>
<td>30,959</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 forecast</td>
<td>31,609</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 forecast</td>
<td>32,146</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change 2017-2022</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the numbers of children and young people with SEND were to change only in line with population changes the following tables show the expected numbers of children with an EHCP over the next 5 years (Table 11.3 based on School census population, Table 11.4 based on SEN2 population).

Table 11.3 - Projected number of children in Portsmouth City schools with SEND based on forecast January School Census population figures and maintenance of current % of EHCPs and SEN Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Pupil population</th>
<th>EHCP (3.3%)</th>
<th>SEN Support (12.3%)</th>
<th>Total SEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28,581</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>4,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29,381</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>4,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30,174</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>4,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>30,959</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>4,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>31,609</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>4,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>32,146</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>5,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.4 - Predicted numbers of pupils with an EHCP based on SEN2 population figures (See Appendix 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Portsmouth population 0-19</th>
<th>EHCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>49,949</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>49,951</td>
<td>1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>50,125</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50,429</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>50,815</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>51,244</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes across age groups

Whilst the population overall is expected to increase slightly this is not reflected across all of the age groups with the primary age population decreasing over the next 5 years by 1.2% and the secondary age population increasing by 14.7% (Table 11.5). This increase in secondary aged pupil numbers is expected to continue for some time and will put increased pressure on secondary school places. There will be a subsequent pressure on Post 16 places.

Table 11.5 - Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts for Portsmouth by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>12,981</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>12,836</td>
<td>12,911</td>
<td>13,075</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>14,964</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>14,996</td>
<td>14,979</td>
<td>14,857</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>10,378</td>
<td>10,727</td>
<td>11,089</td>
<td>11,394</td>
<td>11,707</td>
<td>11,903</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19 years</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>11,332</td>
<td>11,204</td>
<td>11,145</td>
<td>11,176</td>
<td>11,367</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19 years</td>
<td>49,949</td>
<td>49,951</td>
<td>50,125</td>
<td>50,429</td>
<td>50,815</td>
<td>51,244</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: HCC SAPF 2016)

Applying these population changes to the current number of EHCPs across each of the age groups, whilst also factoring in a potential increase in EHCPs at Post 16, it is predicted that the number of EHCPs could increase by up to 23% by 2022 (Table 11.6)

Table 11.6 - Predicted number of Portsmouth children with EHCPs by age based on known numbers coming through the Early Years Panel, population change and predicted increase in Post 16 and Post 19 plans applied each year to the 2017 SEN2 Return number of EHCPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Early Years Panel tracks and monitors pre-school children with SEND and the numbers of children with complex needs and PLMD are beginning to rise, as forecasted. Processes are in place for early identification and intervention and it is anticipated that there will be a rise in EHC assessments in the pre-school age range.

The increase in statutory protection for pupils up to 25 years of age could result in an increase in EHCPs being maintained beyond 19 years especially for those young people with more complex needs.

The forecasted number of Post 16 and Post 19 pupils with an EHCP over the next 5 years is shown in the table below (Table 11.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post 16</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated number of plans funded from HNB</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from previous year</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11.7 - Forecasted numbers of Post 16 and Post 19 EHCPs (based on current plans projected forward)**

**Changes in prevalence**

In considering to what extent true changes in incidence and prevalence may account for an increase or decrease in the number of children with SEND one group of factors dominates.

With improvements in maternity and neonatal care, the number of high risk pregnancies, premature babies or babies with complex needs who survive the neonatal period and infancy has been increasing year on year and is expected to continue.

Health technologies are improving allowing disabilities and conditions to be diagnosed earlier, with the availability of medical equipment enabling children to leave hospital and attend school.

Research evidence suggests that there is an increase in prevalence of children with profound and multiple learning disabilities of approximately 4.8% per year. It is likely that this increase will apply to all children with a more complex range of needs and has therefore been applied to forecast figures.
In considering other areas of SEND there does not appear to be clear evidence of any other true changes in prevalence. However as understanding of SEND increases so can perceptions of prevalence increase too. Improved diagnostic pathways for autism has resulted in more children being diagnosed but does not necessarily indicate an increase in prevalence. Increased awareness of social and emotional needs, in particular trauma, and the impact that this can have on a child has resulted in anecdotal reports of an increase in children presenting with social, emotional and mental health difficulties.

**Improvements in awareness, identification and classification**

There have been significant improvements in the awareness of SEND amongst professionals, parents and society as a whole supported by a better understanding of different forms of SEND, a wider acceptance of ‘difference’ and the development of inclusivity in schools, leisure and the workplace.

There is however still a long way to go. With continued research, acceptance of diversity as the ‘norm’ and a wider understanding of inclusion for all children, it is anticipated that practice will continue to evolve and grow with children and young people being supported within and by their communities, whatever their needs.

Having been stable at 3.1% for many years the percentage of children with an EHCP increased in 2017 to 3.3%. Whilst this may reflect increasing need and parental expectations, it is also felt to be a by-product of the SEND Reforms. It is anticipated that the numbers of EHCPs will remain at 3.3% for another year or so before returning to around 3.1% once the reforms are embedded and stabilised (Table 11.8).

The decrease in the number of children on SEN Support has brought Portsmouth in line with the national average and statistical neighbours. It is expected that this level of prevalence will now plateau at around the current level of 12.3%.

**Table 11.8 - Projected numbers of pupils with SEND based on School Census population figures and decreasing % of EHCPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School population</strong></td>
<td>28,581</td>
<td>29,381</td>
<td>30,174</td>
<td>30,959</td>
<td>31,609</td>
<td>32,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EHCP (3.3% →3.1%)</strong></td>
<td>940 (3.3%)</td>
<td>970 (3.3%)</td>
<td>996 (3.3%)</td>
<td>991 (3.2%)</td>
<td>980 (3.1%)</td>
<td>997 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEN Support (12.3%)</strong></td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>3,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>4,799</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>4,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of significant note over the last 5 years has been the increasing recognition of autism or autistic spectrum conditions. Whilst much progress has been made in the diagnostic pathway, this was still the most frequently cited gap in provision especially for children with high functioning autism.

Whilst the concept of neurodiversity may prove pivotal in the understanding and management of all children it is likely that the numbers of children presenting with autism over the next few years will continue to increase before plateauing. With an estimated prevalence of 1.1% it would be expected that the numbers could increase to 300-350. To bring the numbers in line with national averages and statistical neighbours the increase could bring the numbers nearer to 400.

Although the numbers of children and young people in Portsmouth with social, emotional and mental health needs is higher than national averages and statistical neighbours across all age phases this was cited by many professionals as a growing area of need. Whether the numbers will continue to grow or whether Portsmouth is ahead in terms of the identification of these pupils is difficult to determine. It is clear however that this is an area that needs to be closely monitored and that the work being undertaken through the Emotional Health and Well-being Strategy is important in proactively managing this demand.

**Changes in primary and secondary needs**

From discussions with SENCOs and Headteachers and an analysis of the data it is clear that the primary need for many pupils is out of date.

Whilst there is a process for determining the primary need, for those children who present with a range of needs it is sometimes not clear which should be recorded as the primary need.

Primary need is recorded when the EHCP is finalised. Whilst it is reviewed at each annual review this rarely results in the need being changed on the database.

Having a clear understanding of the needs of the SEND population is vital in ensuring that provision is available to meet need.

**Recommendation 11.2:** Guidance and training is developed for all those staff who determine primary need to improve accuracy and consistency. Primary need is reviewed at all annual reviews and any changes updated on the database.
**Impact of increasing the age range to 25 years**

The Children and Families Act (2014) increased the age range of statutory protection from 19 years to 25 years.

Whilst the impact of this has been slow to materialise it is notable that in 2017 the number of statements / EHCPs for young people in Portsmouth aged 20-25 increased from 1 to 22. With the number of EHCPs in the 16-19 age group having increased from a steady state in the mid-50s for many years this doubled to 120 in 2016 and 232 in 2017. It is likely that these numbers will continue to increase as families and colleges make use of the additional funding and protections that an EHCP brings.

Developing an offer that is appropriate to this age group has also been slow to start but will be driven by demand as young people who have been in receipt of the support of an EHCP move through the system.

**Parental preference**

In line with changing perceptions of SEND, parental views have changed. Once deemed to be schools with highly negative connotations, special schools have been transformed with new appealing buildings, highly experienced staff, an approach that values all children, believes that they are worthy of an education and views their needs as positive challenges. All the Special Schools in Portsmouth have been rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted.

In contrast the demands on mainstream schools have increased with many schools struggling to manage the range and complexity of needs encountered. Whilst being generally supportive of primary schools, nearly all parents consulted expressed concern regarding secondary provision.

The increasing recognition of parents as equal partners, endorsed by the Children and Families Act, has given parents a voice and more power in determining how their child's needs are met. Many are using this voice to push for specialist provision whether that is at a special school, through a tribunal or an out of city placement. As a result demand for specialist provision has increased.

The Information Advice and Support Service (IASS) provides valuable information but parents report being confused by the complexity of the system and the lack of information to make informed choices. They tend to rely on advice from trusted professionals who can be highly influential in swaying parental opinion.

It is vital that parents have access to accessible information and are supported to make informed choices with professionals providing advice based on an understanding of the full range of provision available.
Changes in societal attitudes

There has been significant progress in attitudes towards SEND over the last 20 years largely driven by representative organisations with an understandable bias towards adults.

Greater public exposure, especially through avenues such as the Paralympics has furthered understanding and acceptance of special needs and disability especially for people with physical disabilities.

Recent broadcasts of programmes around autism have raised awareness of the challenges people face and the current focus on mental health issues will increase recognition and support for many.

Whilst awareness of SEND in schools as a whole has improved there are still areas of practice that have not changed and are significant gaps in driving forward real change such as limited inclusion of SEND in teacher training; the rigidity of the curriculum; challenging mainstream school environments especially at secondary level; and the medical model of impairment.

It is hoped that as understanding and acceptance of diversity in all areas of life improve so will the support and management of children and young people with SEND. If all schools operated a model of provision as practiced by the existing highly inclusive schools many of the issues frequently highlighted by professionals and of concern to parents would be eliminated.

The increasing inclusion of children with SEND in mainstream schools will drive forward a continual change in attitudes and by so doing support further inclusion in the future.

Conclusion

- The pupil population will increase over the next 5 years
- The population at secondary level will increase more than other age groups and will impact on numbers coming through post 16 in due course.
- The numbers of pupils requiring an EHCP is expected to, at least, increase in line with population increases, therefore remaining at 3.3%, or will hopefully return back to previous level of 3.1% and then plateau. Forecasts have been based on the upper limit of 3.3%.
- The numbers of children requiring SEN Support is expected to plateau at 12.3% or continue to decrease to about 12%.
- The numbers of young people with an EHCP Post 16 and Post 19 is likely to increase
- The ratio of children with EHCPs compared to SEN Support is likely to stabilise at 1:4
• The prevalence of children with profound and multiple learning difficulties and very complex needs is likely to increase

• The numbers of children with autism and SEMH are likely to continue to increase (even though the numbers of children with SEMH are already above national) due to an increase in awareness, identification and possibly prevalence

• There are some significant differences in prevalence of needs compared with national data most notably autism, SEMH, SLCN and MLD

• Coding should be looked at as a matter of urgency to ensure that data reflects needs to inform future planning

• All professionals working with children and families with SEND need to understand the continuum of provision available, criteria and processes for accessing provisions, the city strategy of inclusion so that they can offer informed advice and direct parents to appropriate sources of support and information.

• Increasing understanding and acceptance of disability within society will support and be supported by the inclusion agenda
12 Provision required to meet future need

This review has been undertaken within a national and local context of increasing demand, over and above predicted levels, especially on special school places, which has put pressure on the high needs block. With no additional resources or signs of this demand abating it is clear that the current response to meeting this need is not sustainable. The introduction of national funding changes means that it is no longer possible to subsidise between blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant. With a remit of ensuring that future demands can therefore be met which are financially sustainable, the review has explored the options available.

The following options are based on data from a variety of sources including PCC Finance and SEND Teams and the Commissioning Contracts Officer. Due to different reporting requirements it has been difficult to obtain accurate comparable data from one source. Data presented at this point in time is for indicative purposes only; figures are approximated and no uplifts or increases have been applied. If it is decided to take forward any of the following options, a full cost benefit analysis will need to be carried out to ensure financial viability and sustainability.

CURRENT POSITION - March 2018 (taken from SEN2 Return January 2018)

Mainstream schools
There are currently 467 children with a Portsmouth maintained EHCP in a Portsmouth or other local authority mainstream school. The funding for these pupils will range from £10,100 - £16,000 for a high end plan (Element 1, 2 and 3).

Inclusion centres
There are currently 90 children in inclusion centres in Portsmouth at a cost of £921,000

Special School provision
There are currently 420 children in PCC Special Schools (excluding Harbour School) (394 in YR - Y11 and 26 in Post 16 at Mary Rose) at a total cost of £8M (17/18 Special School budget shares excluding Harbour school).

Current weighted average placement costs
Willows £10k plus £12.9k = £22,900
Cliffdale £10k plus £8.1k = £18,100
Mary Rose £10k plus £11.6k = £21,600
Redwood park £10k plus £6k = £16,000

There are also 30 children in maintained special schools in other local authorities
Post 16 provision
There are 344 young people with an EHCP maintained by Portsmouth:

- 10 are in out of city independent special schools (included in the 36 out of city placement figure below)
- 45 are in Portsmouth special schools (Mary Rose 26, Redwood Park 7, Harbour 12)
- 14 are undertaking apprenticeships, traineeships or are in work
- 76 are not in education, employment or training (NEET)
- 199 are in local colleges within the travel to learn area. Of these 108 are being funded through the High Needs Block at a total cost of £786K
(Source: PCC SEND Team)

Out of city placements
As at March 2018, Portsmouth has 36 children and young people in independent specialist out of city placements at a total cost of £4,465,927 broken down as follows:

Education - £2,177,796 (average £60,494 per student)
Social Care - £1,589,294
Health - £532,894
Transport - £165,943
(Source: PCC SEND Team)

OPTIONS FOR MEETING PREDICTED FUTURE NEED

It is predicted that the number of EHCPs will increase, at a minimum, in line with population increases and increases in prevalence, but potentially also as a result of increased expectations and demand.

This increase is expected to be most significant in the numbers of children with severe learning difficulties and complex needs which has already put pressure on special school places.

Special Schools

The need and demand for Special School places is predicted to increase year on year due to increasing numbers of children and young people with severe and complex needs and autism and the increase in age of statutory protection.

Two different methodologies have been used to determine the number of places that may be required by 2022 (Appendix 4 - Complex needs place forecasting).

29 SEN2 January 2018
For ease of reference, places for pupils with complex learning difficulties are described as *complex*, and places for pupils with complex/profound and multiple needs are described as *complex*.

**Methodology 1**

Based on *current pupil numbers and historic trends (which will include not only need but demand)* it is predicted that numbers requiring specialist provision could increase to **600 by 2022, if no action is taken.** This figure includes Post 16 & Post 19 places which it is anticipated will be in demand due to the statutory increase in protection to 25 years.

**Table 12.1 - Methodology 1 - Complex needs places needed by 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age phase</th>
<th>No of additional places required 2022</th>
<th>Total places required 2022</th>
<th>Cost per place based on current weighted averages</th>
<th>Total cost of provision 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>50 complex 18 complex 68</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>£20,500 (average of Willows and Cliffdale)</td>
<td>£5,637,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11 complex 32 complex 43</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>£18,800 (average of Redwood and Mary Rose)</td>
<td>£4,324,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total YrR-Yr11** | 111 | 505 | £9,961,500 |

| Post 16   | 32 complex 11 complex 43             | 69                        | £18,800 (average of Redwood and Mary Rose)      | £1,297,200                 |
| Post 19   | 3 complex 23 complex 26              | 26                        | £21,600 (based on Mary Rose)                    | £561,600                   |

**Total Post 16** | 69 | 95 | £1,858,800 |

**TOTAL** | 180 | 600 | £11,820,300 |

*(Cost per place figures are averages of the current weighted average placement costs)*

The potential cost of specialist provision for pupils YrR - Yr11 by 2022 would be £9,961,500.

The potential cost of specialist Post 16 and Post 19 provision if attached to current Special Schools would be £1,858,800.
The total revenue cost of Special School provision in 2022 would be £11,820,300 (Plus transport costs of approximately £3k per pupil attending special school)

An increase in places would require capital funding.

Methodology 2
Place planning based on forecast changes in population and prevalence predicts an increase in Year R - Year 11 that is similar to that identified through methodology 1 even though methodology 2 does not include the impact of demand. It does highlight that the number of children with complex needs is increasing.

Historically, the majority of young people in special schools requiring Post 16 SEND provision for complex and complex+ needs have transitioned to college (or stayed at Mary Rose Post 16 provision) and this is reflected in methodology 2. This shows a lower anticipated need (compared to methodology 1) for specialist Post 16 provision in spite of the increase in statutory protection to 25 years. It is based on proactive management to ensure that young people have a range of attractive options including academic and vocational courses, apprenticeships, supported internships as well as high quality provision from adult social care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age phase</th>
<th>No of additional places required 2022</th>
<th>Total places required 2022</th>
<th>Cost per place based on current weighted averages</th>
<th>Total cost of provision 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>35 complex 18 complex+ 53</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>£20,500 (average of Willows and Clifdale)</td>
<td>£5,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>22 complex 33 complex+ 55</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>£18,800 (average of Redwood and Mary Rose)</td>
<td>£4,549,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total YrR-Yr11</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>£9,879,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 16</td>
<td>7 complex 10 complex+ 17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£18,800 (average of Redwood and Mary Rose)</td>
<td>£808,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Post 16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>£808,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,688,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lower prediction of 125 additional places needed by 2022 has been used to consider the future options for provision.
Responding to this increase in need and demand by expanding Special School provision is an option although in the current climate may not be financially sustainable and continues to support the belief that Special School is the only option for many of these pupils. Portsmouth considers itself an inclusive city and this must allow for pupils with complex needs to be educated in mainstream provision whenever this is achievable and desirable.

The options below consider alternative ways of meeting these pupils' needs.

**Additional special school places**

Whatever options are considered there will be some children whose needs are so great that they will require specialist provision. There are likely to be approximately 18 primary age and 33 secondary age children with complex† needs (See Table 12.2 and Appendix 4 - Complex needs place modelling).

If Special School provision was increased to accommodate these 51 pupils the cost of Special School provision would increase.

\[
51 \times £21,600 \text{ (current weighted average placement cost)} = £1,101,600
\]

**Total Special School costs in 2022 = £9,101,600**

This option would require capital funding.

Alternatively the review has identified that there are children currently in special school whose needs could be met in an inclusion centre or mainstream school. In order to meet the need for 51 additional places for children with the most complex needs the threshold criteria for Mary Rose, Clifffdale and Redwood Park could be raised. As a consequence there would be more children at Clifffdale and Redwood Park with complex† needs and some children who would currently meet the criteria for Clifffdale / Redwood Park attending mainstream schools. Under this model mainstream schools would be expected to support children with more complex needs. Schools would need support from a robust outreach offer.

(See Appendix 10a for potential pathways for children with complex† needs)
**Willows Centre for Children**

Willows Centre for Children has for the third year running opened a Year R class for pupils who meet criteria either for Cliffdale or Mary Rose special schools. In September 2018 in addition to the 20 pupils attending a reception class at Willows there will be approximately 6 pupils attending a Year 1 class. Capital funding has already been allocated for these additional places.

Place modelling (Appendix 4 and Table 12.2) has indicated that the number of additional places required for primary age pupils by 2022 could be up to 53 places. One option to meet this need could be more Special School places as outlined above. Another option could be to continue the expansion of Willows to provide an additional Key Stage 1 specialist provision for children in Year R - Year 2 with up to 20 places per year group. This provision would meet the needs of children with complex and complex+ needs. Consideration would need to be given to the destination of pupils at the transition to Key Stage 2.

Such an expansion would impact on the availability of day places and the specialist nursery.

There are two groups of pre-school children in particular who require access to specialist nursery provision - children with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD) / complex medical needs and children with severe social communication difficulties with challenging behaviour. It is recommended that some specialist nursery places are maintained.

This could be achieved by having a dedicated nursery provision at Mary Rose for children with PMLD and a number of places at Willows for children with social communication and challenging behaviour or alternatively having all specialist provision on site at the Willows.

The element 3 top-up rates proposed/agreed for 2018/19 are higher for Willows than for Mary Rose or Cliffdale as reflected in the weighted average placement costs above. Consideration may need to be given as to whether these costs can be brought into line with Mary Rose and / or Cliffdale for school age pupils.

**The cost of 53 places at Willows for Year R - Year 2, based on current average weighted placement costs** = 53 x £22,900 = £1,213,700.

Capital funding will be required.

(See Appendix 10b for potential pathways for children with complex needs)
**Autism Free School**

Already in development, the establishment of the new Autism Free School will be an important addition to the city's provision. The school will meet the needs of pupils with autism as their primary need who will, in general, be pupils with higher functioning autism who present with challenging behaviour. There are 30 places for Portsmouth children.

- 8 at Key stage 2
- 14 at Key stage 3 and 4
- 8 at Post 16

The SEND Team are currently in the process of identifying children who it is felt would meet the criteria for the Free School. Out of those identified so far 7 are currently in out of city independent special schools, 5 are in Portsmouth / Hampshire special schools, 15 are in inclusion centres and 3 are in mainstream schools.

Until the Autism Free School is established it is difficult to determine the cost of a pupil place. Information on potential costs is detailed in the Free School bid as follows:

- The percentage breakdown of pupils that would attract the different element 3 top up banding rates (set out in the original specification as 60% / 30% /10%) was only indicative.
- The LA will pay the element 3 top up banding rate that fits with the pupil's assessed need.
- The element 3 top-up banding rates set out in specification for core, enhanced and exceptional have yet to be finalised for the Special Free School. These were indicative in the specification. The final rates will be set in preparation for the 2020/21 financial year in conjunction with the banding descriptors.
- The LA will work in partnership with the confirmed provider of the Special Free School to agree the final banding descriptors

Based on an average of the element 3 top-up banding rates set out in the specification the cost of 30 places in the new Autism Free School would be:

\[ 30 \times £15,900 = £477,000 \]

(See Free School bid and Appendix 8 for costing details and Appendix 10c for pathways)

Whilst the Autism Free School will go some way to support the increase in need for special school places identified above, it is predicted that there will still be a significant shortfall in provision.
**Inclusion centres**

Inclusion Centres provide a valuable offer, supporting those pupils who have significant special educational needs but who can nonetheless thrive in a mainstream setting. They provide a viable and affordable alternative to special school provision.

Options for provision within an inclusion centre could include increasing the number and/or the capacity of inclusion centres to support more pupils, and/or changing the remit of the current inclusion centres to cater for pupils with more complex needs. For example, changing the criteria for admission from Communication and Interaction to complex needs.

In addition to changing the type of need, inclusion centres could have the remit changed to offer pupils the option of being educated full time in an inclusion centre with the mainstream school providing opportunities for social inclusion.

The inclusion centre could be managed by the host mainstream school, as is the current arrangement, or by a special school. Managed and staffed by a special school (which would include pupils being on the special school roll) would bring specialist knowledge and skills into the mainstream setting, benefitting the centre pupils and wider mainstream population.

Another option to consider would be seconding specialist staff from a special school to work in the inclusion centre with a potential reciprocal arrangement whereby a member of mainstream staff was deployed to the special school. This could provide an excellent continuing professional development opportunity and support the sharing of expertise.

Current inclusion centre pupils would be educated in mainstream settings.

Cost of increasing the number/capacity of inclusion centres/pupil places by 20 places = 110 pupils x £16,000 per place = £1,760,000

Cost of changing the remit of inclusion centres only = current cost of 90 pupils x £16,000 per place = £1,440,000
**Mainstream schools**

Some pupils with complex needs could be considered for mainstream provision with appropriate support. These are children who would benefit from the social inclusion of a mainstream setting but will require an alternative curriculum based on developmental needs. They are likely to have higher cost plans in mainstream school of approximately £6,000 to reflect the complexity of their needs.

The number of pupils that could be educated within a mainstream setting will be dependent upon attitudes towards SEND, inclusion, parental expectations, financial constraints and the pull of special schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Proposed additional YrR - Yr11 places required</th>
<th>Average placement cost</th>
<th>Cost of additional places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special schools</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>£18,800-£20,500</td>
<td>£2,120,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£21,600</td>
<td>£1,101,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 51 additional places for complex* needs made available by shift in criteria and more flexible use of range of provisions with no actual increase in places at Mary Rose, the following numbers would need to be accommodated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£22,900</td>
<td>£916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Free School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>£15,900</td>
<td>£349,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion centres increased capacity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream schools</td>
<td>26 to offset increase at Mary Rose</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£2,001,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options are presented as pathways in Appendix 10.

It is unlikely that mainstream schools will be able to manage the higher levels of complexity of these children without additional support.
**Enhanced outreach service**

The development of an enhanced outreach service could potentially prevent some pupils from going to out of city provision and ensure that mainstream schools were adequately supported to meet the needs of pupils with more complex needs.

As proposed in Recommendation 10.7.8: *The current Outreach provision should be reviewed with new outreach arrangements in place for September 2019.*

In addition, investment in language provision for secondary aged pupils would prevent those with speech, language and communication needs (SLCN), currently 6, going to out of city provision.

This provision could be in the form of a Language Inclusion Centre or a peripatetic speech and language therapy service developed as part of an enhanced outreach service. This latter option would have the advantage of supporting a much larger number of pupils, at all age phases, with EHCPs or on SEN Support, which would help to address the need to improve outcomes for this latter group. (See Recommendation 10.1.7)

The other group of children whose needs impact on their learning, behaviour and relationships are those with sensory processing issues, some of whom are on the autism spectrum. Investment in a sensory integration service would help schools in supporting these pupils and prevent young people with autism being placed in an out of city placement following a tribunal for sensory needs.

Linking both of these therapeutic outreach services with a specialist teacher will ensure that advice and interventions are appropriate and sensitive to the educational context and dovetailed into the curriculum and demands of a school environment.

Cost of Speech and Language Therapist = £50,000
Cost of Occupational Therapist or Sensory Integration practitioner (post graduate) = £50,000
Cost of specialist teacher = £50,000
*(Salary costs are rounded estimates)*
**Post 16 provision**

Due to the increase in statutory responsibility up to 25 and an increase in complex needs progressing through Special Schools it is anticipated that there could be an increase in need / demand for Post 16 provision.

If no action is taken it is anticipated that the numbers of students with an EHCP in 2022 could increase to over 467 (see Table 11.7) as follows:

- the numbers of Post 16 in out of city independent special schools could increase to 19 (see below)
- it is anticipated that the numbers of Post 16 pupils in other local authority special and mainstream schools will not significantly change
- the numbers of Post 16 pupils with complex needs coming through Solent Academy could increase to 43 (see Table 12.2 above and Appendix 10d pathways)
- The numbers of young people undertaking apprenticeships, traineeships or in work with an EHCP is expected to grow to between 40 - 50 (Note: An apprenticeship is paid work with training as opposed to full time provisions below)
- The number of young people NEET with an EHCP could increase unless provision is made available that engages young people or plans are ceased
- 354 or more students will be in local colleges within the travel to learn area.

It is anticipated that potentially 200 students could need funding through the High Needs Block by 2022.

**Table 12.4 - Comparison of costs of different options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No of places potentially required 2022</th>
<th>Average cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OOC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>£60,494</td>
<td>£1,149,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special school places</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£18,800</td>
<td>£808,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traineeships</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>£6000 (Element 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College provision</td>
<td>354 + (only 200 expected to need funding from HNB)</td>
<td>£8,200</td>
<td>£1,640,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To try and prevent this predicted increase in the continuation of EHCPs beyond Year 11 or Year 14 the following actions are proposed:

- SEND Team to proactively work with special schools and parents to transition young people into local Post 16 college provision with or without a plan
- Develop a clear Post 16 and Post 19 offer, co-produced with parents and young people, that offers a viable and supportive alternative to special school provision

The aim would be to transition all young people to SEN Support and adult services without the need for a plan.

The potential costs of implementing these actions would be:

- Capacity of SEND Team. Consideration might need to be given to increasing the capacity of the SEND Team and relevant support teams to support these actions, working with parents, young people and providers.
- Additional costs associated with improving the local Post 16 offer which might be significant dependent on need

Out of city placements (OOC)

If no action is taken it is likely that the current level of out of city placements will either remain the same i.e. 36 or increase and young people will continue to stay in their OOC placement Post 16 and potentially Post 19. The result would be an overall increase in numbers out of city. If 50% of pupils currently in out of city schools stay on until 25 years the numbers of children and young people in out of city schools will increase to 47 (19 of whom will be Post 16) with total costs increasing by 2022 to £5,810,489 broken down as follows (Appendix 8):

- Education - £2,843,230
- Social care - £2,043,378
- Health - £710,526
- Transport - £213,355

If the numbers placed out of city were to increase the costs above would be higher.

To maintain the numbers of out of city placements at current levels a number of actions would be required as follows:

- SEND Team to proactively work with OOC providers and parents to transition young people back into the city for Post 16 provision
• Develop a clear Post 16 and Post 19 offer, co-produced with parents and young people, that offers a viable and attractive alternative to out of city provision
• Develop a marketing strategy to ensure the local offer becomes the provision of choice
• Request a breakdown of provision and costs of placement from OOC providers to ensure provision is aligned to the EHCP
• SEND Team to actively review provision at each key stage to ensure that progress is being made, outcomes are being achieved within realistic timescales, provision is aligned to the EHCP and there are no better alternative provisions within the city.
• Block commissioning at a regional level for out of city provision

Costs
• Capacity of SEND Team. Consideration might need to be given to increasing the capacity of the SEND Team and relevant support teams to support these actions, working with parents, CYP, providers.
• Additional costs associated with improving the local Post 16 offer which might be significant depending on need

It has already been identified that the majority of children in OOC placements could have their needs met if appropriate educational provision was made available e.g. enhanced outreach including speech and language therapy and occupational therapy, the new Autism Free School and residential provision.

Residential provision

Whilst it is acknowledged that there will always be a small number of children and young people who need out of city provision, there are a number who are in those placements due to lack of educational provision locally or social care reasons.

There are approximately 5 children, with complex learning needs, who could be educated within the city if there was residential provision available to meet complex health and social care needs (Recommendation 10.1.10).

Further exploration of this recommendation, taking into consideration the potential costs combined with the requirements of registration, has concluded that this would not be an option that PCC would be keen to pursue. Alternative options discussed have included setting up a residential school in collaboration with another local authority; setting up a residential school in partnership with a local independent provider; or block commissioning residential provision from a local independent provider.
## APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS PRESENTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Special School**    | **Pros**<br>- Satisfies demand  
 **Cons**<br>- Does not align with strategy of inclusion  
- Unaffordable, the trend of increasing costs seen over recent years will continue with consequent impact on funding to mainstream schools  
- Will require capital investment |
| **Willows KS1**       | **Pros**<br>- Minimises capital investment  
- Provides a nurturing environment  
- Allows for child to develop and needs to emerge which will better inform future provision  
- Keeps options for future provision open  
 **Cons**<br>- Adds in a move for child at Key Stage 2  
- More school places will restrict the number of referred nursery and day places available |
| **Autism Free School**| **Pros**<br>- Autism Free School already in progress  
- Provides a graduated response for an autism pathway  
- Meets the needs of pupils with high functioning autism and challenging behaviour - a group frequently identified by parents and professionals as not being adequately catered for  
 **Cons**<br>- Need and demand for places likely to exceed capacity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion centres</th>
<th><strong>Pros</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensures pupils receive specialist support as well as access to a mainstream environment and opportunities for social inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offers small class sizes and a quieter, less distracting environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supports PCCs strategy on inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Viable alternative to special school provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential for preventing out of city placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requires minimal capital investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td>- School leaders may be concerned about the impact of inclusion especially on results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintain children in mainstream schools</th>
<th><strong>Pros</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cheapest option in financial terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will avoid upfront investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- May encourage mainstream schools to increase capability (skills and expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supports PCCs strategy on inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td>- Significant risk of increase in tribunals if parents unable to access special school provision leading to increase in special school placement in or out of city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasing the competency of mainstream schools will incur costs and be difficult to achieve without a well-funded and robust outreach service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will increase school spend as evidenced by existing highly inclusive schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EHCPs in mainstream schools will increase. Funding will need to be directed to support children with plans. Schools may redirect funding away from pupils with SEN Support. Pupils with SEN Support have poorer outcomes in Portsmouth compared to national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Enhanced outreach support | **Pros**  
- Requires minimal investment  
- Could support inclusion of increased numbers of children with SEND including pupils on SEN Support through increasing competency of mainstream schools  
- Wide reach of team  
- Prevent tribunals through provision of therapy where indicated  
- Prevent out of city placements where this is required for therapeutic provision or where therapy will complete the educational offer within the city  
- Highly flexible - could be piloted in the first instance to gauge benefit  
- Cost / benefit ratio likely to be high | **Cons**  
- Source of funding for therapy may be contentious  
- Would require careful management to ensure pupils are targeted for support appropriately and outcomes assured.  
- Quality assurance is key  
- May cause confusion with contracted NHS therapy provision |

| Residential provision | **Pros**  
- Residential school provides wrap around care, education and therapy under one roof  
- Provides for the full continuum of need  
- Keeps the majority of children within the city  
- Inclusive  
- Supports the retention of links with birth families | **Cons**  
- Provision needs to be managed within an overarching strategy for future SEND provision  
- Need range of provisions to be able to move children around  
- More cost effective to send some children out of the city  
- Registration requirements |
Conclusion

The review has identified that the numbers of children and young people with complex needs will increase requiring additional places to be created within the system. It has also been recognised that these children’s needs could be accommodated within a number of different settings. With a focus on the child's and family's needs and wishes, having a diverse range of options, including mainstream schools, outreach support, inclusion centres, special schools and colleges, ensures that children and young people have choices in the provisions available that supports them to develop within the wider context of their community. All the options presented have implications and will need careful planning but in the view of the Review Team are viable and sustainable for the future.
13 Conclusion

The SEND Strategic Review was commissioned to review the provision to children with special educational needs and disabilities. It was tasked with considering the continuum of provision available to meet the range of identified need, as well as the sufficiency of provision going forward, to ensure that special provision could be commissioned and funded efficiently and in a way that achieves the best possible outcomes for children and young people.

Portsmouth and Southampton cities have worked collaboratively to commission the review which has allowed direct comparisons to be made and afforded the opportunity for learning from each other, developing joint solutions and hopefully, the sharing of ideas and best practice going forward.

The review was given six priorities to focus on namely:-

1. High cost out of city placements
2. Alleviating the pressure on special school places due to increasing needs and demand
3. Availability of Post 16 provision
4. Meeting the needs of children and young people with autism
5. Use of resourced provisions
6. Identification of SEND and thresholds for EHCPs

These priorities were chosen due to their impact on the demand for provision and the financial pressure they placed on the High Needs Block.

In addressing these priorities it became clear that each city's policies and practice on inclusion and outreach were key enablers to addressing the challenges presented.

In conducting the review the team met with parents and young people, and a range of stakeholders from education, health and social care; researched the evidence base and national policy; analysed information and financial data; and attended local meetings to share emerging findings and recommendations.

The report produced contains a considerable amount of narrative which aims to present the complexity of SEND in a readable and informative way as well as giving the background to the proposed recommendations.

The recommendations have been collated into those that can be easily achieved within existing resources; those that will require further work mostly in collaboration with other parties; and those that will require investment or structural change.
Within the course of the review a number of key themes have emerged that the team feel are crucial to achieving the aims of the review. They are presented here as key memorable messages for both Local Authorities.

1. Be proactive - doing nothing is not an affordable option
2. Hold the baton - don't let children slip through the net whilst being referred from one school or service to another
3. Manage the demand, meet the need
4. Change the culture - EHCPs must not be seen as the ticket to other services
5. Tracking - follow the child's journey and intervene as soon as possible
6. Work with parents as equal partners - they know their child best and are experts in their child's needs
7. Push for more inclusion - encourage, support, challenge schools to become more inclusive.
8. Encourage all parties involved with SEND to take on a corporate responsibility to meet the needs as a city wide responsibility
9. Outreach - ensure that settings have the support they need when they need it, and make sure that it addresses the issues and 'turns the child around'
10. Solve the problem, don't just process the child

Finally we would like to thank everyone who has so generously and willingly given their time and energy to share with us their knowledge, expertise, thoughts, concerns and aspirations. There is a clear commitment in both cities to working closely with parents and a clear recognition of the need to look ahead and plan. We have been impressed by the passion and care that we have seen and commitment to improving the outcomes for children and young people across both Portsmouth and Southampton cities.
14 Recommendations

Level 1 Recommendations (Require no further consultation, relatively straightforward to implement, cost neutral)

Recommendation 8.1: A review of the process of coding, recording and amending primary need to be undertaken by the SEND and Information Teams with the aim of establishing a robust system to inform future planning and provision.

Recommendation 8.2: High importance should be attached to leaders from the SEND, Information and Finance Teams, the School Organisation Team, Portsmouth CCG, Health Providers and Social Care meeting annually to share and collate data to ensure that the city has an accurate picture of all the children with SEND, how needs, numbers and costs are changing to support continuous improvement and review, planning and future forecasting. This should link with the Needs Assessment and report into the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.

Recommendation 10.1.6: Over and above the Local Offer and the School SEN Report, clear guidance both written and available in person should be provided to parents to support their decision-making regarding suitable provision for their child. Local provisions to be 'marketed' to highlight to parents the offer and advantages for the child and their family.

Recommendation 10.1.8: The review supports the establishment of the Free School for children with autism and challenging behaviour. Whilst it is not the intention of the review to return children to Portsmouth from out of city there may be scope for working with schools and parents of those pupils coming up to the end of an age phase to explore the potential for transitioning pupils back.

Recommendation 10.1.9: The review supports the current development of The Harbour School Vanguard Key Stage 4 provision in Cosham. Focussing on a vocational curriculum this provision will be better equipped to meet the needs and interests of the most vulnerable young people with the most challenging behaviour.

Recommendation 10.2.1: The Early Years Panel to be the central point for the collation of all data / intelligence on children 0 - school age with complex health, social care, educational need.

Recommendation 10.2.2: The Early Years Panel to provide quarterly reports on numbers, age, type of need for forecasting purposes, which is shared with the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group and School Organisation Team.
Recommendation 10.2.3: SEND needs and placement planning to be included in the annual cycle of school placement planning undertaken by the School Organisation Team, supported by an annual refresh of the SEND needs assessment and reported to the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.

Recommendation 10.2.5: The criteria for Special School placement is clearly defined

Recommendation 10.2.6: The process for determining provision is clearly defined and communicated to all professionals involved. Reviewed annually, it is included in the induction of the workforce for SEND so that parents receive coherent information and advice

Recommendation 10.3.3: Strengthen process for sharing information between Education SEND team, the School Organisation Team and Adult Social care teams on young people (14 years) with EHC plans for forecasting purposes and to begin the plan for individual young people transitioning to college with a real or virtual team, with clearly defined responsibilities taking a lead on this work

Recommendation 10.3.5: Social care Adult LD team and other teams in Adult Social Care to develop and roll-out a self-assessment tool for young people to clarify needs, develop clear pathways and access to provision. Closer liaison between all social care teams to support young people.

Recommendation 10.3.6: The Local Authority should work proactively with students, their families and independent out of city specialist providers in transitioning students back to the city for their Post 16 education

Recommendation 10.4.1: All mainstream schools to have an identified Autism Champion to support the development of an autism friendly environment, autism friendly practice and individualised support to pupils on the autism spectrum. This staff member may not hold a qualification relating to ASC but will attend regular training sessions, have experience of working with pupils “on the spectrum” and be able to influence policy and practice in the setting.

Recommendation 10.4.2: Workforce development in special and mainstream schools to support children and young people with high functioning autism Development of “Autism champions" programme to ensure high quality provision is in place and that provision is "tribunal proof" (i.e. to prevent PCC being directed to provide out of city placement by SENDIST when PCC feels confident that local provision is/should be an effective and efficient use of resources)

Recommendation 10.4.3: All special provision to have an ASC specialist (including SEMH provision)
Recommendation 10.4.4: Criteria for admission to the new special free school for children and young people with autism to be determined and factored into the strategic plans for future provision.

Recommendation 10.5.2: Clear entry and exit criteria need to be refreshed for the Language Inclusion Centre and Communication and Interaction Centres and applied consistently within the context of the overall provisions within the city. Consideration to be given to applying the same criteria for the Language Inclusion Centres as the Communication and Interaction Centres as the same approaches and strategies are used in these settings for pupils with similar needs.

Recommendation 10.5.3: All Inclusion Centres to offer a graduated provision of withdrawal and integration according to each child's needs. Primary and Secondary Inclusion Centres supporting the same needs must work collaboratively to prepare pupils for effective transitions.

Recommendation 10.5.5: Inclusion Centres (and mainstream schools) must be able to access CAMHs LD team.

Recommendation 10.6.1: It is recommended that SENCOs, Head Teachers and colleagues in other agencies understand funding mechanisms and the pressures on the High Needs Block and apply the best evidenced based approaches to support children and young people. Supervision (including peer supervision) is also essential to ensure that SENCOs feel confident and competent with local processes relating to the Code of Practice and working with parents. These steps should help to ensure Education, Health and Care assessment requests are made for pupils with severe, long term, complex needs.

Recommendation 10.7.1: A definition of inclusion to be co-produced with parents, children and young people and professionals across the city.

Recommendation 10.7.6: Schools Therapy Pack to be used as a universal resource to enable all pupils to achieve, augmented by access to consultation with Occupational Therapy, Speech and Language Therapy and Physiotherapy for targeted pupils.

Recommendation 11.1: PCC to review the methodology and approach to forecasting to make it more robust and accurate notwithstanding the challenges involved in SEND forecasting. Data teams to be proactively involved, working alongside SEND Teams and LA Leaders, including the School Organisation Team, using hard data and soft intelligence to forecast, using the same methodology, to allow for year on year direct comparisons of change and continual improvement in accuracy to inform future planning. This should link with the Needs Assessment and report into the SEND 0-25 Joint Commissioning Group.
Recommendation 11.2: Guidance and training is developed for all those staff who determine primary need to improve accuracy and consistency. Primary need is reviewed at all annual reviews and any changes updated on the database.

Level 2 Recommendations (May require some further consultation and planning)

Recommendation 10.1.1: Pupils are identified earlier and clear protocols developed to enable decisions to be made quickly to allow pupils access to a school that can meet their needs. Focus on the identification of risk factors for social, educational breakdown and early intervention at first sign of breakdown to support child, family and school to maintain child in city linked to Early Help Processes, MATs and MASH.

Recommendation 10.1.2: A process is established for monitoring all children who are at risk of not having their needs met within the city and/or have been excluded from school. Designated SEND Officers are given responsibility for monitoring and tracking pupils to ensure that needs are properly identified and addressed early on, with the outcomes of external support monitored and specialist provision for those most vulnerable to poor outcomes considered as an option at the earliest point rather than as a last resort. Assessments and advice must be commissioned from appropriate services in a timely manner to ensure Panels can draw on high quality information for decision making purposes. Proactive anticipation of need is essential to guard against failed placement.

Recommendation 10.1.3: All children and young people in out of city schools are monitored and reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that placements are appropriate, value for money, delivering the interventions as detailed in each child’s EHCP and achieving expected outcomes. The statutory guidance on visiting pupils in residential settings needs to be embedded in PCC practice.

Recommendation 10.1.4: Contracting framework for out of city placement to be developed. Contracting framework, in partnership with neighbouring authorities, with providers could provide guarantee of placements, set clear expectations of provision, reduce hidden or unforeseen costs, increase accountability in terms of outcomes and lead to a reduction in exclusions. Greater financial stability for out of city providers may be an incentive for collaboration.

Recommendation 10.3.2: Building on the work of the Post-16 Forum, explore specific gaps in provision. For example, provision for pupils with hearing or/and visual impairment. This might also apply for physical disability, autism and support for re-engagement of young people with SEMH, in co-production with parents and young people. Explore opportunities for shared provision with Hampshire or/and Southampton/West Sussex.
Recommendation 10.3.4: Work with adult services to scope the costs and viability of developing supported housing and educational packages.

Recommendation 10.5.1: Placements at inclusion centres to be proactively managed with more active movement into and out of the centres to ensure that all provisions are supporting the pupils with the greatest need. All pupils should be reviewed at the end of each key stage to assess on-going suitability of provision. Decisions relating to placement should be made at the specialist inclusion support panels by a range of professionals including the staff in charge of the inclusion centres.

Recommendation 10.5.4: All inclusion centres to have a specialist qualified teacher to support pupils’ educational needs within both the classroom and the centre and to contribute to the offer of outreach support to local mainstream schools.

Recommendation 10.5.6: A network for Inclusion Centres to be developed to encourage the sharing of good practice, support continuing professional development and offer supervision with support from PCC Inclusion Service and the Portsmouth Teaching School Alliance.

Recommendation 10.7.2: Inclusive practice to be celebrated and supported with appropriate support and challenge made to settings to ensure a consistent approach and ethos is developed city wide. A kite mark of inclusion to be established based on ‘What makes good inclusion’ / Inclusion Audit.

Recommendation 10.7.4: Ordinarily available provision needs to be reviewed and updated regularly with SENCOs to ensure consistency of approach and expectations.

Recommendation 10.7.5: Portsmouth is a "needs led city" and professionals must focus on a functional assessment to meet needs rather than diagnosis. This needs to be embedded in policy and practice across the SEND 0-25 workforce.

Recommendation 10.7.7: All schools to be encouraged to develop their own provisions to meet the increasing number of pupils in mainstream with SEND.

Recommendation 10.7.8: The current Outreach provision should be reviewed with new outreach arrangements in place for September 2019. A clear, transparent, consistent and quality assured offer of Outreach Support should be readily available for mainstream schools, delivered by primary and secondary specialists, designed to support individual pupils and build capacity in schools. This could be linked to the development of a peripatetic team (see 10.1.7) and possibly target SEMH and ASC with a focus on increasing up take from secondary schools in particular.
Level 3 Recommendations (Require further consultation and planning and/or investment/funding)

Recommendation 10.1.5: Consideration to be given to increasing the capacity of the SEND Team to support the above recommendations

Recommendation: 10.1.7: Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and a specialist teacher (ASD) to be funded to support the communication, sensory, and functional needs of pupils with SEMH and ASD. It is suggested that this is developed as a peripatetic team, as part of the wider outreach offer. The specialist teacher could be attached to the Secondary Autism Inclusion Centre.

Recommendation 10.1.10: Develop local residential provision and respite for pupils with severe and complex needs/autism and challenging behaviour. Provide support for those children and young people whose needs have a significant impact on the family and/or for those who need 24hr wrap around provision. Consideration could be given to whether there is scope for this to be developed in partnership with Southampton and Hampshire especially for those children who need to be out of their local area.

Recommendation 10.2.4: Consideration should be given to how best to meet the needs of pre-school children with SEND, options include:
- one nursery setting to provide special needs provision across Portsmouth with capacity and expertise to meet all needs
- protecting a number of nursery places at Mary Rose Academy for those children with the most profound needs who are clearly going to require an ongoing placement there
- more pre-school children supported in mainstream settings.

Recommendation 10.2.7: Additional provision for children with complex needs will be required, which may include additional capacity at special schools, inclusion centres and/or mainstream schools (See also recommendation 10.5.7: Consideration to be given to the development of a primary and secondary inclusion centre for pupils with learning difficulties to reduce pressure on special schools places. This may contribute to solutions about meeting need and demand bearing in mind capital funding pressure).

Recommendation 10.2.8: The level of therapy provision for children and young people with SEND to be reviewed to ensure needs are met and children are enabled to access the curriculum.

Recommendation: 10.3.1: PCC should continue to work with local post 16 providers to ensure sufficiency of high quality, inclusive educational provision for students with SEND. This is an opportunity for co-production with young people and families
Recommendation 10.5.7: Consideration to be given to the development of a primary and secondary inclusion centre for pupils with learning difficulties to reduce pressure on special schools places. This may contribute to solutions about meeting need and demand, bearing in mind capital funding pressures.

Recommendation 10.5.8: Consideration to be given to the level of therapy provision to pupils in inclusion centres to ensure that all the child's needs are addressed and access to a mainstream environment and curriculum is enabled.

Recommendation 10.7.3: Ways of incentivising inclusion to be explored. This could include a 'seed' fund for mainstream schools to provide a financial contribution to schools wishing to develop a more inclusive offer.
## Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Agreed place number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder (includes Asperger’s Syndrome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADCS</td>
<td>Association of Directors of Children's Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMHS</td>
<td>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG</td>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA</td>
<td>Education Skills Funding Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCP</td>
<td>Education, Health and care Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHE</td>
<td>Elective Home Educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1</td>
<td>Funding per pupil place in mainstream schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 2</td>
<td>Notional SEND funding in mainstream schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3</td>
<td>Top up funding for pupils with an EHCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants SAPF</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNB</td>
<td>High Needs Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>Key stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIT</td>
<td>Local Authority Information Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Inform</td>
<td>Local Government Inform (lginform.local.gov.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASH</td>
<td>Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>Moderate learning difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Multiple sensory impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOC</td>
<td>Out of city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Portsmouth City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLD</td>
<td>Profound and multiple learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAP</td>
<td>Schools Capacity Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Southampton City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMH</td>
<td>Social, emotional and mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCO</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs and / or Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCN</td>
<td>Speech, language and communication needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Severe learning difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpLD</td>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulty (E.g. Dyslexia, dyspraxia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 1 - Stakeholders consulted

### Children and Young People
Joe Wells and members of Dynamite

### Parents / carers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>Portsmouth Parent Carer Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Jewell</td>
<td>Portsmouth Parent Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Morgan</td>
<td>Parent Carer Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents from Portsmouth Down Syndrome Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents attending Portsmouth Picnic in the Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voluntary / community sector
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Harrison-Sales / Katie Board</td>
<td>Autism Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Jolly</td>
<td>National Deaf Children's Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education Providers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison Beane</td>
<td>Executive Head, Solent Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Oliver-Catt</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Cliffdale Special School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Tondeur</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Redwood Park Special School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hunkin</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Harbour Special School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Dunford</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Willows Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Vaghela</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Portsdown Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsey Cook</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Southsea Language Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Gidney</td>
<td>SENCO, Victory Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Morgan</td>
<td>Unit Manager, Victory Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Young</td>
<td>SENCO, Milton Park Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Stocks</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Arundel Court Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Cook</td>
<td>Inclusion Leader/SENCO, Arundel Court Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Mullen</td>
<td>Portsmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa Muscat</td>
<td>Portsmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Hill</td>
<td>Portsmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Barlow</td>
<td>Havant &amp; South Downs Sixth Form College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Collison-Boles</td>
<td>Havant &amp; South Downs Sixth Form College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Education Providers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Aldridge</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Serendipity School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pip Smith</td>
<td>SENCO, Serendipity School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Galloway</td>
<td>Head teacher, The Forum School, Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Goldstraw</td>
<td>Head teacher, Clay Hill School, Lyndhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Harte</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Coxlease School, Lyndhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gittins</td>
<td>Head teacher, Southlands School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Larry Bartel  Head Teacher, St Edwards School, Romsey  
James Fenemore  Deputy Head Teacher, St Edwards School  

**Health Providers**  
Dr Jonathan Prosser  Clinical Director, Children & Families, Solent NHS Trust  
Kate Slater  Head of Early Help and Prevention  
Neil Smith  Designated Clinical Officer, Solent NHS Trust  
Lois Pendlebury  Long Term Care Lead, Solent NHS Trust  
Dr Mina  Paediatrician, Solent NHS Trust  
Dr Jo Crane  Paediatrician, Solent NHS Trust  
Erica Goddard  CAMHS LD Team, Solent NHS Trust  
Dan Bevan  Autism Liaison & Support Worker, Solent NHS Trust  

**Social Care Providers**  
Mark Stables  PCC Adult Social Care  
Clive Pfeiffer-Richardson  Beechside Short Breaks  

**LA Leads**  
Alison Jeffery  Director of Children's Services  
Mike Stoneman  Deputy Director - Children, Families and Education  
Julia Katherine  Head of Inclusion  
Caroline Corcoran  Head of Sufficiency, Participation & Resources  
Hayden Ginns  Children's Transformation Manager  
Amanda Percy Post 16  Post 16 Commissioning Manager  
Karen Spencer  SEN Team Lead  
Sarah Christopher  Portsmouth Education Partnership (PEP) and School Inclusion Manager  
Debbie Price  Social Care - Safeguarding  
Michael Henning-Pugh  Children's Social Care  
Mark Stables  Adult services  
Alison Edgerton  Finance Team  
Julie Sabiston  Access and Entitlement Officer  
Karen Ebdon  Commissioning Contracts Officer  
Penny Farrelly  Children's Services Strategic Information Manager  
Andre Merel  Education Information and Performance Team  
Jennifer McKenzie  Education Information and Performance Team  
Julie Dean  Communications  
Claire Currie  Public Health Consultant  

**Health Commissioners**  
Andrea Havey  Portsmouth CCG
Appendix 2 - Views of children, YP and parents/carers

The experiences and views of parents and carers in Portsmouth
Workshop held at Frank Sorrell Centre - 9 August 2017

Parents and carers report more positively about identification and support for special educational needs in the early years and through infant, junior, primary schools and academies, which are seen as having more flexibility to respond to individual need, than at secondary schools. SENCOs across all key stages have been praised for their support for children and young people, particularly when they have time to dedicate to the role (some SENCOs have more classroom teaching responsibilities than others). Special schools are highly valued and inclusion centres are regarded positively. The process of assessment for an Education, Health and Care has been commented upon positively, with parents feeling more involved. Parents and carers report that they feel listened to and that their input has helped to improve processes and services. (SEND Early Identification and Early Support Delivery Plan)

Parents and carers have reported concerns about processes and provision in relation to special educational needs:

- Waiting times for services such as CAMHS, Speech and Language Therapy and Educational Psychology. There is still a pervading feeling that diagnosis helps access to services and support even though this is not the case. One parent felt very frustrated and commented that it feels "like being in limbo" having to wait for a diagnosis.
- Not knowing what services a school can access or that they purchase and not being clear when they can expect a review from Services that have formerly been involved.
- School staff not appearing to recognise or agree with the needs identified in an Education, Health and Care Plan.
- Feeling the need to commission private assessments to avoid waiting for services, to access services not being provided or to counter information and advice provided by local services with which parents disagree and feel is inaccurate.
- Feeling that having a "high status" professional "on side" is needed in order to raise the profile of the child's needs and ensure needs are acknowledged and met.
- Some parents report that some schools say they cannot meet their child's needs and this appears to be more likely to occur with secondary schools. Parents speak of using Elective Home Education if preferred secondary school provision not available.
- Transition between schools and concern about changes in level or type of support provided, particularly at secondary school transition and particularly with a child who does not have the "protection" of an EHC plan. There is concern about children and young people not progressing on transition to secondary school. One parent said "my child would not last a week in
secondary school”. This child had good social skills but was three years behind peers with school work.

- Children and young people at SEN Support stage of the Code of Practice are seen as being at risk of not having needs fully identified or met.
- Lack of support for children and young people with autism

When asked to consider what might be done better, recommendations from parents and carers formed a number of themes:

- Listening to and respecting parental views and regarding parents as equal partners
- Early identification of needs and timely referrals to CAMHS and other services by schools or/and access to CAMHS in schools.
- Linked to the above, ensuring up to date information is used in the review of children and young people at SEN Support or with EHC plans to inform decision making about provision and placement at transition points in particular (primary to secondary school for example)
- Better communication between schools and parents and between staff in schools to ensure needs are properly communicated, understood and the identified support and strategies are in place and implemented
- More training for staff in mainstream schools (particularly secondary schools) to meet the needs of pupils with SEN, particularly with the change in criteria for Portsmouth special schools which are now focusing on children with more complex needs, and the rise in numbers of pupils with social communication difficulties (with or without a diagnosis of autism). This links to training for staff to understand the social and emotional needs of children and young people and that behaviour communicates a need which requires proactive, positive intervention. It also links to parental concern about attitudes towards “inclusion”, support and interventions at secondary school transfer.
- More specialist provision for children and young people with SEN (Autism and high functioning autism were mentioned frequently, but also learning difficulties/disabilities); Inclusion Centres in more schools and particularly in secondary schools, where the use of a primary style classroom also received several endorsements.
The views of young people with SEND about provision in Portsmouth
Dynamite Pizza evening - 15th November 2017

The Pizza Evening was attended by approximately 20 young people, late teens/early twenties, attending college or university or who had left further or higher education, with a diverse range of special needs, difficulties or disability. There was an equally diverse range of views about the advantages or disadvantages of special or mainstream provision and what is required to improve the educational experience and outcomes for young people with additional needs.

Several young people, perhaps especially those with a more severe learning difficulty or disability felt that special school placement had been very beneficial to them. Other young people felt that mainstream school was preferable in terms of overall outcomes and preparation for adulthood. Interestingly, this view was held by those who had nevertheless found mainstream school challenging from a social perspective - perhaps because they were thinking of longer term outcomes. This group included young people with Asperger's syndrome and high functioning autism, visual impairment and physical disability. Some also had experience of being in a resource base or inclusion centres and felt this had been helpful, offering a base and a place to go but also offering mainstream education and opportunities.

More than half of the young people attending the session talked about being bullied, whether at mainstream or special school.

**With reference to recommendations for mainstream schools, the young people said the following:**

- Address issues of bullying
- Mixed ability classes
- Don't use label autistic" or "disabled"
- Educate pupils about disabilities
- Break down barriers - use of braille and sign language available
- Smaller classes
- More (units) inclusion centres for specific difficulties/disabilities
- Less homework
- Emotional support from well-being team
- After school clubs
- Support (including 1:1) for those who need it - investment and funding required

**And recommendations relating to special school provision:**

- The use of the term "special school" offends and is socially divisive
- Address issues of bullying
- Adapt curriculum and provide flexibility for different abilities
- Use different teaching styles and approaches
- Provide extra support for English and more assistance with work (writing)
Appendix 3a

Primary Need

A child or young person has SEN if they have a learning difficulty or disability which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. All pupils with SEN have an assessment of their primary need. The following charts show the breakdown of need in Portsmouth by primary, secondary and special school, compared to the national averages and ranked by prevalence.

Primary need in primary schools

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: speech, language and communication needs (Primary): 31.3%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: moderate learning difficulty (Primary): 22.3%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: social, emotional and mental health (Primary): 17.0%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: other difficulty/disability (Primary): 9.2%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: specific learning difficulty (Primary): 6.8%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: physical disability (Primary): 3.7%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: autistic spectrum disorder (Primary): 3.2%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: no specialist assessment of type of need (Primary): 2.7%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: visual impairment (Primary): 1.6%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: hearing impairment (Primary): 1.4%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: severe learning difficulty (Primary): 1.8%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: multiple learning difficulty (Primary): 0.4%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need: profound & multiple learning difficulty (Primary): 0.0%
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Primary need in secondary schools

- % of SEN pupils with primary need speech, emotional and mental health (Secondary): 24.4%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need specific learning difficulty (Secondary): 24.1%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need moderate learning difficulty (Secondary): 22.5%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need speech, language and communication needs (Secondary): 21.8%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need other difficulty/disability (Secondary): 9.8%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need special educational needs (Secondary): 9.7%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need moderate learning difficulty (Secondary): 7.5%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need physical disability (Secondary): 2.9%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need learning impairment (Secondary): 2.3%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need visual impairment (Secondary): 2.4%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need multi-sensory impairment (Secondary): 1.8%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need specific learning difficulty (Secondary): 0.3%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need other difficulty/disability (Secondary): 0.2%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need profound & multiple learning difficulty (Secondary): 0.5%
- % of SEN pupils with primary need learning impairment (Secondary): 0.0%
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Primary need in special schools

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: autism spectrum disorder (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 23.0
  - Mean for All English unitary authorities 2018/17 (academic) %: 23.4

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: severe sensory difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 19.8
  - Mean for All English unitary authorities 2018/17 (academic) %: 25.8

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: social, emotional and mental health (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 16.9

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: multiple sensory difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 14.8
  - Mean for All English unitary authorities 2018/17 (academic) %: 14.7

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: moderate & specific sensory difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 5.8

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: physical disability (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 6.1

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: visual impairment (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 2.3

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: other special educational needs (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 1.3

- % of SEN pupils with special educational needs and disabilities: type of need (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 1.5
  - Mean for All English unitary authorities 2018/17 (academic) %: 1.5

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: hearing impairment (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.9

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: multi-sensory impairment (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.3

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: physical disability (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.5

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: sensory impairment (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.2

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: speech & language difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.1

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: mental health difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.0

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: learning difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 1.6

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: autism spectrum disorder (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.2

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: social, emotional and mental health (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.2

- % of SEN pupils with primary need: multiple sensory difficulty (special school)
  - Portsmouth 2018/17 (academic) %: 0.0
Methodology

The predicted numbers of complex needs places required for 2018-22 presented in this paper has been calculated using two different methodologies. The first is based on current pupil numbers and historic trends of pupil movement into and out of special schools with numbers tracked through year on year. The second methodology uses the current pupil numbers as the starting point and then applies average population and predicted prevalence changes, with assumptions made for predicted numbers at Post 16 and Post 19. The two methodologies, summarised on the last sheet, may be considered as a worse and best case scenario for planning purposes.

Current APN / commissioned pupils for each setting (January 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willows</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method 1

The forecasted figures are based on the following assumptions:

1. Starting point is the 2017 current class lists
2. Forecasts are based on numbers per year group rolling forward except where comment added
3. Places in Yr R and Yr 1 2018 is based on known children and their identified needs not on the capacity of schools
4. Willows has been excluded from the forecasts with places allocated according to predicted need for future provision
5. Number of places required for special provision will
   - increase in line with population increase
   - increase by 4.8%pa for PMLD population (approx 2 per year)
6. The pathway into primary special provision (Cliffdale or Mary Rose) is either
   - at Year R for pupils identified / assessed prior to starting school and who have attended Willows, a mainstream setting or no setting (The proportion of children entering Cliffdale or Mary Rose from mainstream nurseries is likely to increase as fewer nursery places have been available at Willows since the establishment of a YrR class.
   - or by entering special provision at any point between Yr1 - Yr 6 from Willows or transfer from mainstream school, an inclusion centre or pupil moving into area (10 pupils have notionally been forecast to enter Cliffdale from mainstream settings in Yr3 from 2019 onwards and 1 child predicted to transfer into Mary Rose)
For secondary provision (Mary Rose or Redwood Park) the pathway is:
- continuation of Mary Rose placement or transfer from Cliffdale
- transfer from mainstream at Yr 6
- transfer from mainstream or moving into area at any other point between Yr 7 - Yr 11 (notionally 3 transfers from mainstream to Redwood Park are predicted in Yr 8; 2 transfers in Yr 9; and 1 transfer in Yr 10. 1 transfer from Redwood Park to Mary Rose is factored in at Yr 9)

Pupils moving up from primary to secondary phases have been apportioned as follows:
- Cliffdale pupils apportioned 75:25 to Redwood Park: Mary Rose
- Redwood Park intake 60:40 from Cliffdale:mainstream

Currently the majority of Yr 11 Redwood Park pupils move onto FE College (Most to Highbury and Portswood, Southdowns, or St Vincents). It is forecast that some of these pupils will in future want to stay on for Post 16.

The forecast for Post 16 is based on:
- 30% of Redwood Park pupils wanting to stay on into a Redwood Park type Post 16 provision from 2019 onwards

Currently approximately 50% of Yr11 Mary Rose pupils go to College (Portsmouth College or St Vincents) and 50% stay on in Post 16 provision. It is anticipated that the number wanting to stay on will increase towards 100% dependant upon the response from Colleges to the increasing complexity of need.

The forecast for Post 16 is based on:
- 50% staying in in 2018; 70% staying on in 2019; 80% staying on from 2020 onwards

The forecast for Post 19 is based on:
- 50% of Post 16 Mary Rose pupils wanting to stay on into Post 19 provision from 2019
- potentially 50% of Redwood Park pupils who have stayed on into a RWP Post 16 type of provision wanting to stay on Post 19

Ratio of PMLD:Complex needs is roughly 1:1.8 and is likely to change to 1:1.4 as the complexity of needs and prevalence of children with PMLD increases

The APN figures are as at 2017. The APN for Mary Rose is 143 but has been allocated across primary, secondary and Post 16 phases equally according to the number of year groups.

**Method 2**

The forecast figures are based on the following assumptions:

1. Starting point is the 2017 current school numbers
2. The following predicted population changes between 2017-2022 are:
   - 0 - 4 years: 1.6%
   - 5-10 years: -1.2%
   - 11 - 16 years: 14.7%
   - 16-19 years: -2.2%
3. There will be an increase in prevalence of complex needs of 4.8% per annum. This has only been applied to primary aged numbers
4. Post 16 and Post 19 figures are estimates based on the assumption that with the increase in statutory protection the numbers of students Post 16 maintaining an EHCP is likely to rise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W CD MR</th>
<th>YR</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>2023 Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>2022 Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>2022 Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>2022 Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>2022 Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>2022 Y6</th>
<th>Willows</th>
<th>Cliffdale</th>
<th>Mary Rose</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W CD MR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current APN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 4 PRIMARY PLACES FORECAST MODELLING 2017-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W CD MR</th>
<th>YR</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>2023 Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>2022 Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>2022 Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>2022 Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>2022 Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>2022 Y6</th>
<th>Willows</th>
<th>Cliffdale</th>
<th>Mary Rose</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YR predicted to increase year on year by population increase and increase in prevalence of complex needs**

Placements in YR & Y1 2018 is based on known children and their identified needs not on the capacity of schools.

The APN for Mary Rose is for all ages from nursery through to Yr 14. For modelling purposes the APN has been divided by the number of year groups (16 year groups) including nursery to give an approximate APN for Primary, Secondary and Post 16 phases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale apportioned 75:25 RP:MR</td>
<td>RP transfers 60:40 from Cliffdale: Mainstream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Y8 transfers from mainstream to RP added per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Y9 transfer from RP to MR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Y9 transfer from mainstream to RP added per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Y10 transfer from mainstream to RP added per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Y11 transfer from mainstream to RP added per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redwood Park</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>146</th>
<th>152</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 4

**POST 16 PLACE FORECAST MODELLING 2017-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast based on 30% of Redwood Park pupils staying on into Post 16 from 2019
Forecast based on a gradual increase from 50-80% of Mary Rose pupils staying on into Post 16
## APPENDIX 4  
POST 19 PLACE FORECAST MODELLING 2017-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast based on 50% of Y14 pupils at Mary Rose continuing in Special Education from 2018
Forecast based on 50% of Y14 pupils at Redwood Park continuing in Special Education from 2022
## Methodology 1 - COMPLEX NEEDS PLACE PLANNING BASED ON CURRENT PUPIL NUMBERS AND HISTORIC TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Current APN / commissioned places</th>
<th>Forecast places</th>
<th>Diff from APN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs Post 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs Post 19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex needs Post 16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex needs Post 19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase per year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on current pupil numbers working through each year with historic trends (based on need and demand) of pupil movements into and out of year groups applied

Predicted increase in demand due to increase in age of statutory protection, if not managed

## Methodology 2 - COMPLEX NEEDS PLACE PLANNING BASED ON FORECAST CHANGES IN POPULATION AND PREVALENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Current APN/Commissioned places</th>
<th>Forecast places</th>
<th>Diff from APN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Primary</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Secondary</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Post 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex* YR - Y11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex* Post 16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in line with population decrease (-1.2% 2017-2022) and increase of 4.8%pa= average of 4.56%pa

Change in line with population increase (14.7% 2017-2022) = average of 2.9%pa

Predicted potential need for places

Change in line with population increase (14.7-1.2=13.5% over 5 yrs) and increase of 4.8%pa=average of 7.5%pa

Predicted potential need for places
Appendix 5 - What makes good inclusion?

Findings from the SEND Strategic Review

What have we learnt?
- Lack of definition and understanding of inclusion and ownership of inclusion
- Inclusion is about values and equity not about everyone having the same or achieving the same and yet we have set a standard that everyone has to achieve National Curriculum levels and rates of progress

Primary
- Generally support children with SEND well due to their nurturing environment and ability to flex according to need
- Provide structure and are ‘forgiving’ of individual differences

Secondary
- System that counts things, focuses on results and excludes children with disabilities. Schools say they are measured on their data. Ofsted takes this into consideration but parents influenced by league tables.
- Challenge of providing a curriculum in a secondary school for a diverse range of need
- Require pupils to conform to systems, rules, patterns of working, environment. Have little flexibility
- More challenging curriculum at primary and secondary level which has increased the gap between level to be attained and performance
- Linear syllabus introduced at expense of modular which are largely unobtainable
- Lack of flexibility to adapt to child - GCSE, AQA, functional skills

What are the recommendations?
- Need alternative entry level curriculum
- Functional skills pathways and AQA units

What do inclusive schools do?
- Inclusion is a feeling, not a place
- It's about being asked to dance, not just invited to the party
- They focus on the whole child, placing the child's social, emotional, therapeutic needs on an equal par with their academic needs
- They recognise the need to address the child's social, emotional, therapeutic needs first to enable the child to learn
- They value all children whatever their background or needs
- They 'bend' to meet the child and do not expect the child to 'bend' to the school
- They are flexible and adapt to meet the needs of the child at any one time
• They employ staff who sign up to the values of inclusion so that they have a whole team pulling in the same direction
• They are solution focused and look at what they can offer, not what they can't
• They are supportive to parents, treat them as equal partners in their child's care and listen to them. As a result they gain the trust of parents.
• They see behaviour as an communicative intent / expression of the child's communication not as 'bad behaviour' and respond accordingly
• They invest in additional staff and resources to ensure that staff feel competent and confident to meet each child's needs e.g. buying in extra SLT and EP time, appointing pastoral workers, a lead for autism, a lead for attendance and welfare
• They are good are early identification and intervene early to avoid problems escalating
• Their focus is on supporting each of their pupils to achieve their best rather than on the schools league table results
• They effectively differentiate the curriculum to meet a wide and level of need
• They can effectively accommodate up to 30% of children with SEN.
• They rarely exclude children

Draft definition of inclusion currently being developed by Portsmouth Inclusion Group - May 2018

Attitudes, means and methods that ensure as many learners as possible can access mainstream education and be educated locally wherever possible. Enabling children and young people to benefit from education or training, with support if necessary to ensure that they can make progress in their learning, build and maintain positive social and family relationships, develop emotional resilience and make successful transition to employment, higher education and independent living.

We want all children and young people in Portsmouth to……..

1. Feel included
2. Feel part of the community
3. Go to nursery, school or college locally
4. Be valued / not discriminated against (appreciating diversity)
5. Have equal opportunities
6. Have positive attachments and social / family relationships
7. Make successful transitions
8. Develop emotional resilience and positive self esteem
9. Aspire to live independently and participate
10. Achieve their potential
11. Be physically, emotionally and mentally healthy
12. Be safe
13. Be heard
We want all families in Portsmouth to ..... 

In order to achieve this we will............

1. Ensure children and young people can attend their local mainstream nursery, school or college wherever possible  
2. Provide support to meet needs and remove barriers to achieve and create an environment that is welcoming to all  
3. Support children and young people to develop skills / resilience to overcome barriers  
4. Work together across services and respect and value children and young people as individuals  
5. Develop the skills, knowledge and competence of the workforce
Over June Dynamite has been looking at the topic of inclusion.

We visited students on the independent living and work skills courses at Highbury College and we held a pizza evening attended by 10 young people (with a range of special educational needs) to discuss 3 questions.

1. What does inclusion mean to you?
2. When does inclusion work well?
3. When does inclusion not work well?

At Highbury College most students had not heard of the term inclusion so we talked about what it meant to be included instead.

We found that a lot of young people with a disability believe that in mainstream schools/colleges/youth clubs/etc staff won’t understand their needs.

Young people also talked about feeling like they didn’t fit in in mainstream environments and that even if schools and colleges met their needs they felt that they would still feel left out at break time and in things like group Facebook chats outside class.

A lot of the examples of where young people felt included in mainstream settings were when they had opportunities to work together on things which they were good at. For example a young person talked about having drama classes with other children who didn’t have SEND and that because she was able to do the drama as well as other students she felt included.

Young people also talked a lot about the attitudes of staff and other young people, and that it is important to feel that you are listened to, respected and wanted.

These are the notes which were taken at the pizza evening and at Highbury College.

**What does inclusion mean to you/what does it mean to be included?**

- Pizza eve
  - Including people
  - No one left behind
  - Everyone who takes part and volunteers, includes everyone
  - Being part of a team
  - Differentiating groups/education etc to suit individuals (having time and patience)
  - Keeping information confidential
  - Everyone having a say
- respecting others views
- listening to others
- treating people fairly and equally
- inclusion of different cultures/age/sex/disability
- friendship within a community
- different communication methods – being listened to
- work, social
- something people understand but is difficult to explain
- make sure you can take part in activities
- Highbury students
  - no bullying
  - feeling a part of something, a club
  - chats at breaktimes
  - being part of something
  - a gathering of people
  - being invited in/on the register
  - taking part in something
  - being part of a group
  - talking to other people/being listened to
  - working as a team together
  - enjoying being around people

Inclusion done well/times that you have felt included
- Pizza eve
  - Getting to know services locally and what disabilities they are inclusive for
  - being able to have time out when it is needed
  - people listening
  - specialist departments for special needs with teachers for support
  - allowing suitable independence
  - being allowed time to speak
  - at a youth club was mixed with non disabled people. All treated the same and had opportunity to participate in all group games
  - Charles dickens youth club, staff and young people are friendly
  - Having 2 groups (one for young people with disabilities and one for young people without disabilities) and allowing the choice to mix
- Highbury students
  - being with friends the same age because we have something in common
  - in mainstream school to have a group of people which has the same [special educational needs] to be together
  - summer school helping introduce young people to college life
  - being part of Highbury
  - watching football
  - meeting up with friends
  - drama, because you are able to work at the same level
  - it doesn’t matter not having friends on other courses
- travelling with the group to SCF
- football
- singing at my club
- video games
- playing sports against other colleges
- playing boccia
- work – staff at asda giving us work to do, feeling that they value what we do
- travel training helpers joining in
- going somewhere that is suitable for you/your talents
- meeting new people and new staff [when moving to college/school] it would help to introduce pupils to staff before they go
- summer school at highbury college
- feeling safe
- being part of the church choir, working as part of a team, being involved in choosing songs.

**Inclusion done poorly/times that you haven't felt included**

- Pizza eve
  - During sports people not wanting disabled people on their teams, swapping out for other people or not picking them.
  - People without a disability being right in your face or being angry
  - happens more in social situations than in structured lesson time
  - In colleges young people being given preferential treatment because of their special needs which means that they are resented
  - trip to paultons park, told I couldn’t go on a ride because of the stairs
  - in respite services people with more severe needs being prioritised.
  - other young people calling me names
  - social media, being left out of group chats
  - not having enough staff (at youth club)
  - being somewhere where very few people have special needs.

- Highbury Students
  - being put in a group where you don’t belong
  - being left out of games
  - being left behind by my friends
  - bullying in schools, should be 0 tolerance but often isn’t
  - finding lessons boring, there should be more choice of what you do at school, college is better for that reason
  - being told you can’t take part in lessons eg swimming and science
  - teachers assuming worst, being labelled
  - feeling embarrassed, confused, anxious
  - group chats

**General comments**
- it doesn’t matter not having friends on other courses
- special schools are good but they are not for everyone
Appendix 7

Comments from professionals attending the Portsmouth Inclusion Conference 12
October 2017

**Successful Inclusion is:**

Is there a leaflet / list of resources schools can access / read?

**Good understanding of young person by staff and pupils**

CPD that is joint to support change

**Child not standing out from the rest of the class**

Opportunities to say and talk about inclusion

**Well-rounded healthy (mentally & physically) children**

Treating child as a whole being not a statistic

**Knowing the child**

Get the nurses to do an environmental checklist

**Provision making changes to meet a young person’s needs**

Systemic change and understanding

**Appreciating diversity instead of tolerating or accepting diversity**

Achievement for all (at any level)

**Appropriate differentiation**

Creating an inclusive environment

**Prioritising relationships and modelling**

Parents and school working in partnership to support and meet the needs of the young person (listening to each other - person centred - non judgemental)

**Giving time to the child**

Systems to support all, not just some

**What soothed as a baby? Would be interesting to explore**

Willingness to problem solve and understand

**Leads giving nurturing messages around inclusion**

Needs can be identified and barriers to learning articulated

---

**Barriers to Inclusion**

Inflexibility, lack of capacity by provision to make changes to support young person's needs.

**Attitudes and behaviours of staff and pupils to those who are different**

No more part time timetables!
Staff training and training costs
Lack of understanding of young people needs

Not having the expertise to meet the child's needs e.g. staff training.
Fear of the unknown

Professionals (including medics) still using non-inclusive terms e.g. normal
More training around working with young people with SEND and more training around specific conditions needed for teachers and all other school staff. More nurture / specialist units attached to schools.

Being so far stretched that you cannot always give provision needed
Too many professionals questioning diagnoses / needs and pointing finger to blame at parents. Not person centred and not helpful in reducing parental anxiety or promoting a good working relationship with parents and child suffers as a result.

Funding
Politicians and Policies
Government expectations for our results without real consideration for the child.
Excessive teacher / education workload

The current primary curriculum
Trust - families feeling it is ok to open up without fear or judgement / other agencies taking over

Why do schools always focus on what the child needs rather than what they are good at? Why should the GCSE's be a considered a one size fits all? Should be progress and destinations ONLY!

Time / effort to do things well long term

Judgements relating to young people / families
Staff confidence and expectations

There is not enough money / funding / resource to provide for all of the needs?
Focus on the child as the problem.

Parent’s not realising schools have changed. We are not all about exam results - others services / support we can provide
Provisions expectation for young person to change to 'fit in'.

Flexible systems
Appendix 8  Details of financial modelling

**Autism Free school - Element 3 top-up banding rates as set out in specification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element 3 top-up rate</th>
<th>Predicated banding</th>
<th>Average cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>£17,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicated banding</th>
<th>Average cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% x £14,000</td>
<td>£15,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% x £17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% x £24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special School current weighted average placement costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Place funding plus Element 3 top-up</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willows</td>
<td>£10k plus £12.9k</td>
<td>£22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale</td>
<td>£10k plus £8.1k</td>
<td>£18,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>£10k plus £11.6k</td>
<td>£21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park</td>
<td>£10k plus £6k</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age range of pupils in out of city placements as at March 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Number of pupils per age group</th>
<th>50% of year group for next 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential costs to education of continuing current placements numbers with 50% of pupils staying out of city until 25yrs based on average rounded cost of placement of £60,494 (range £4,000 - £150,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£2,177,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>£2,177,796 + £60,494 x 11 = £2,843,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Presumes no increase in unit cost and numbers placed remains static)

Potential costs to social care of continuing current placements numbers with 50% of pupils staying out of city until 25yrs (based on average rounded cost of £113,521 per 40% of additional placements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£1,589,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>£1,589,294 + £113,521 x 4 = £2,043,378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential costs to health of continuing current placements numbers with 50% of pupils staying out of city until 25yrs (based on average rounded cost of £88,816 per 16% of additional placements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£532,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>£532,894 + £88,816 x 2 = £710,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential costs of transport of continuing current placements numbers with 50% of pupils staying out of city until 25yrs (based on average rounded cost of £7,902 per 58% of placements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£165,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>£165,943 + £7,902 x 6 = £213,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 9  
### SUMMARY OF SEND DATA AND CHANGES 2010 - 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan census</td>
<td>School population</td>
<td>27672</td>
<td>27241</td>
<td>26936</td>
<td>26994</td>
<td>26891</td>
<td>27107</td>
<td>26887</td>
<td>27693</td>
<td>28209</td>
<td>28581</td>
<td>29381</td>
<td>30174</td>
<td>30959</td>
<td>31609</td>
<td>3246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in school population</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected figures based on SCAP 17 mainstream NCYR-11 forecast**

| Jan census | No of pupils with statements / EHCPs at 3.1% | 834 | 854 | 852 | 832 | 837 | 822 | 849 | 851 | 862 | 940 | 970 | 996 | 1022 | 1043 | 1061 |
| % of pupils with statements / EHCP | 3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |

**Projected % increase based on SCAP 17 mainstream NCYR-11 forecast**

| HCC SAPF 2016 | Portsmouth 0-19 population | 49949 | 49951 | 50125 | 50429 | 50815 | 51244 |
| % change in Portsmouth 0-19 population | 0% | 0.35% | 0.61% | 0.77% | 0.84% | 0.88% |

| SEN2 return data on Portsmouth population of 0-19yr olds whether in school in Portsmouth or out of city in OLA, Independent Schools etc |
| HCC SAPF | Portsmouth 0-19 population | 49949 | 49951 | 50125 | 50429 | 50815 | 51244 |
| No of pupils with statements / EHCPs by age | 5-10 | 151 | 159 | 176 | 184 | 191 | 198 | 205 | 212 | 219 | 226 | 233 | 240 | 247 | 254 |
| | 11-15 | 618 | 654 | 690 | 708 | 724 | 740 | 756 | 772 | 788 | 804 | 820 | 836 | 852 | 868 |
| | 16-19 | 60 | 64 | 68 | 72 | 76 | 80 | 84 | 88 | 92 | 96 | 100 | 104 | 108 | 112 |
| SEN2 Total no of pupils with statements / EHCPs | Total | 883 | 920 | 957 | 994 | 1031 | 1068 | 1105 | 1142 | 1179 | 1216 | 1253 | 1290 | 1327 | 1364 |
| | % of pupils with statements / EHCPs | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |

**SEN2 Total no of pupils with statements / EHCPs**

| Number of new statements / EHCPs issued within the year taken from SEN2 data |
| SEN2 | No of new statements / EHCPs | < 5 | 27 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 30 | 29 | 35 | 43 | 61 | 71 | 70 | 57 | 68 | 43 |
| | 6-10 | 41 | 71 | 70 | 57 | 68 | 43 | 61 | 96 | 103 | 109 | 110 | 99 | 103 | 107 | 108 |
| | 11-15 | 461 | 490 | 399 | 402 | 427 | 444 | 464 | 496 | 513 | 510 | 540 | 560 | 569 | |
| | 16-19 | 59 | 56 | 53 | 54 | 64 | 120 | 232 | 316 | 408 | 426 | 430 | 427 | |
| Total | Total | 883 | 920 | 957 | 994 | 1031 | 1068 | 1105 | 1142 | 1179 | 1216 | 1253 | 1290 | 1327 | 1364 |
| % of pupils with statements / EHCPs | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |

**SEN2 Total no of pupils with statements / EHCPs**

| Number of discontinued statements / EHCPs within the year |
| SEN2 | No of statements / EHCPs discontinued because transferred to another LA | 21 | 23 | 21 | 16 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 23 | 19 | 38 |
| | No of statements / EHCPs discontinued as needs met without a statement or EHCP | 9 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 12 | |
| | Other | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | |
| | No of statements / EHCPs discontinued due to pupil leaving school at the end of compulsory schooling or after | 106 | 100 | 80 | 95 | 80 | 80 | 82 | 116 | 120 | 141 | |
| Total | Total | 138 | 133 | 110 | 121 | 114 | 117 | 119 | 159 | 181 | 171 | |

**SEN2 Total no of pupils with statements / EHCPs**

| Difference between new statements / EHCPs and those ceased |
| SEN2 | Difference between new statements / EHCPs and those ceased | -20 | -21 | -3 | 10 | -2 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 | |

**SEN2 Total no of pupils with statements / EHCPs**
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SEND Strategic Review Priority 2
Children with complex+ needs
(The 51 additional places have been apportioned equally across the year groups within primary and secondary phases)

Option 1 - Revenue cost per annum £1,101,600

Option 2 - Revenue cost per annum £1,104,200

This option uses the 6 nursery places at Mary Rose for primary age pupils
Option 3 - Revenue cost per annum £1,112,000

Children with complex* needs (51 additional places)

KS 1
Willows (8)
£22,900

KS 2-4
Mary Rose (43)
£21,600
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SEND Strategic Review Priority 2
Children with complex needs YrR - Yr11
(The 57 additional places have been apportioned equally across the year groups within primary and secondary phases)

Option 1 - Revenue cost per annum £985,500

Option 2 - Revenue cost per annum £1,033,500
**Option 3 - Revenue cost per annum £952,800**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KS 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Willows (5)</th>
<th>Inclusion centre (5)</th>
<th>Mainstream with outreach (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£22,900</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffdale (3)</td>
<td>£18,100</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Park (2)</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inculsion centre (10)</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream with outreach (10)</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SEND Strategic Review Priority 4
Pathways for children with high functioning autism and challenging behaviour

Current pathway - Revenue cost per annum for 30 pupils KS2-4 = £817,458

Future pathway - Revenue cost per annum for 30 pupils KS2-4 = £477,000
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SEND Strategic Review Priority 3
Post 16

Pathway for students with complex needs - Revenue cost per annum £149,000

Young people with complex needs (10)

KS 4

Mary Rose (10)

Post 16

Mary Rose (5) £21,600

Post 16 College (5) £8,200

Post 19

Adult services without an EHCP

Pathway for students with complex needs - Revenue cost per annum £169,400

Young people with complex needs (7)

KS 4

Redwood Park (7) £16,000

Post 16

Post 16 College (7) £8,200