Inclusion and PRU Model Update

Key Messages

Forum members are asked to:
- Note the overall approach and update on the developing model.
- Note the proposal to increase Localities funding from £2.1m a year to £4.5m by 2023/24.
- Approve the £1.5m transfer to High Needs Block as per the recommendation in Paper 4.
- Note the development work to date around a social investment model the reasons for not pursuing this further, but to also note the draft proposed outcomes framework as a result of this work.
- Agree to the proposed exclusion charge principles as per the conceptual model.

1. Introduction/background

1.1. This paper brings together a number of recent areas of work linked to inclusion and SEND in Sheffield. It follows discussions at the last two Schools Forum meetings linked to all of these areas. Overall there is a growing sense of purpose around this part of the education system in Sheffield driven by the sector, but the pressures nationally and locally, external and internal, remain as high as ever.

2. The Overall Approach and Developing Model

2.1. There are a number of key features on the developing approach to inclusion and SEND that help give an overview of how we are seeking to reshape the system and the following areas are covered in more detail in this report:

- Sector-led
- Consistent and clear
- Graduated from mainstream/universal offer up to the offer for the most complex
- Integrated across education, health and care
- Preventative and person/family-centred
- All-age
2.2. The sector leadership is now in place and driving much of this agenda forward. A draft overview of this as it relates to the school-age population of Sheffield is attached at Appendix 1.

2.3. In addition, we have expanded the sector-led approach as part of our strategic approach to SEND and inclusion – more details on the Inclusion Task Force and Learn Sheffield Team can be found in Appendix 2.

3. Locality SEND Funding

3.1. As reported in the September Forum paper, the Inclusion Taskforce and the seven Locality SEND lead headteachers have been working to improve this element of the system. We now have:

- Consistent locality processes, developed by the sector leads, that are ready to roll-out and based on the existing best practice across localities.
- The best and most consistent understanding of need across the city we have ever had through the Sheffield Support Grid.
- A proposal to increase funding to individual learners through this process.

3.2. The proposal around funding was outlined in the September forum paper, subject to confirmation of DSG High Needs Block income. The plan outlined was to increase from the current £2.1m a year to £4.5m by 2023/24. For 2020/21, this will equate to an increase of £1.3m and this level of increase has been factored in and is affordable in our resourcing plan. For 2021/22 and beyond, we will need to keep this situation under review as further detailed information becomes available following the Comprehensive Spending Review announcements.

4. High Needs Block Transfer and the Social Investment Model

4.1. A significant part of the work around inclusion links to the transfer of £1.5m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. Permanent exclusions reduced for a second consecutive year in 2018/19, although they still remain above national average rates. During the current financial year we have created a new nurture offer for the Secondary Inclusion Panel based at the Herdings Heritage Centre. We have also created a new schools-led offer for Key Stage 2 and 3 pupils at the Earl Marshall centre in locality B. That offer is building further on the step-out nurture offer through a developing multi-agency and whole-family approach to tackle the underlying issues with the aim of creating a more effective and sustainable impact. This model is developing with the potential for a growing offer that could help integration across education, health and care.

4.2. We have consulted schools on doing this again for 2020/21 and the outcome is that 75% of respondents are in favour of this approach (see paper 4).
4.3. This funding has also been linked to recent discussions around a social investment model. This model has the potential to attract additional central government funding from the Life Chances Fund. It works on the basis of us defining a cohort and a set of outcomes we would be willing to pay for with an identified funding stream. The £1.5m high needs block transfer has been linked specifically to targeting those at risk of exclusion and at reducing exclusions so has a potential match for this model. An investor then provides funding to a commissioner to commission a service that will work to deliver the identified outcomes. We would then use the identified funding stream to pay for those outcomes as they are delivered, with the potential that the investor makes a return on their investment if all of the outcomes are met.

4.4. The development work has been undertaken, working to the timelines around the Life Chances Fund that a model would need to be developed and submitted this calendar year. There are two key reasons for not pursuing this opportunity at this point. Firstly the complexity of the model, the timeline, and the number of stakeholders means there is a practical impediment to getting a model sufficiently detailed in the time available. Secondly, in order to be investable we would need to be able to demonstrate a delivery model that has a track record in delivering the types of outcomes we would seek. At this point, the work in this space around vulnerable learners and those at risk of exclusion is developing all the time and key is a growing integration across education, health and care. Pursuing a social investment bond with a defined and separate delivery model using the £1.5m would put at risk the developing work and has the potential to run counter to the need for integration across services.

4.5. The development work to date has had a number of benefits in channelling the thinking around this area of work. One key element of a social investment model is the outcomes framework. Defining a set of outcomes that we would all want for our vulnerable learners, not simply that they are not excluded, but that our most vulnerable learners are safe, settled and ready to learn. The development work around a set of indicators could now be taken forward for further discussion with a broader set of stakeholders across the education, health and care system with the aim of defining a set of shared outcomes for our system that partners can all support. The draft outcomes framework is attached at Appendix 3.

5. Crisis Prevention, PRU and Exclusion Charge

5.1. In the report to September Schools Forum, we signalled an intention to move away from a charge to schools at the point of permanent exclusion. Since the meeting, we have sought to develop a financial model to support the Sheffield Inclusion Centre and in doing so make links to the preventative work under the Inclusion Gateway.

5.2. Through the Inclusion Gateway Leads, Ian Read for Primary and Scott Burnside for Secondary, we are continuing to develop the approaches, principally linked to the Primary and Secondary Inclusion Panels respectively.
As part of this work we are seeking to develop routes for increasing our offer of bespoke packages of support for pupils at risk of escalation, both in terms of exclusion, but making links to the continuing high levels of demand for specialist provision.

5.3. The following principles are proposed for the exclusion charge framework to ensure a sustainable financial model (see also diagram in Appendix 4):

- 250 average places for Sheffield Inclusion Centre. Average based on last three years’ occupancy.
- No charge to schools from April 2020, apart from pupil-led funding and Pupil Premium.
- If demand rises above 250 average occupancy, PIP/SIP/Gateway and Schools Forum will need to consider financial implications of this increase.

A more detailed financial proposal will be tabled at the February Schools Forum.

6. Recommendations

Forum members are asked to:

- Note the overall approach and developing model, including the sector leadership which is now in place.
- Note the proposal to increase Localities funding from £2.1m a year to £4.5m by 2023/24 which will equate to an increase of £1.3m for 2020/21.
- Approve the £1.5m transfer to High Needs Block as per the recommendation in Paper 4 and note the progress as a result of the redirection of funds in previous years.
- Note the development work to date around a social investment model and the recommendation not to pursue this, but to note the draft outcomes framework for further discussion.
- Agree to the proposed exclusion charge principles and note that a more detailed model will be produced, based on these principles, for the February Schools Forum.
**APPENDIX 1: Draft Overview of Inclusion Tiered Approach**

**SPECIALIST PROVISION: Reshape & grow**
INTEGRATED RESOURCES & HUBS --- SPECIAL SCHOOLS --- INDEPENDENT SPECIAL SCHOOLS

**TARGETED SUPPORT: Crisis prevention**
FAST-TRACK ASSESSMENT --- RESOURCE ALLOCATION --- TRACKING --- REINTEGRATION & REVIEW

**EARLY HELP: Pro-active & preventative**
INTEGRATED SUPPORT & TRANSITION REVIEW --- RESOURCE ALLOCATION --- TRACKING --- REVIEW

**UNIVERSAL +: Locality funding & integrated support**
LOCALITY TOP UP FUNDING --- INTEGRATED LOCALITY SUPPORT TEAMS

**UNIVERSAL: Successful inclusive schools**
SCHOOL-SCHOOL SUPPORT --- INCLUSION TASKFORCE --- TRAINING OFFER --- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
**APPENDIX 3: Draft social investment outcomes framework for potential further development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Mental Wellbeing</td>
<td>Strengths &amp; Difficulties Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sustained improvement over 12, 24m period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale</td>
<td>Sustained improvement over 12, 24m period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation: attendance</td>
<td>School Attendance stats</td>
<td>Improvement to over 90% Improvement to over 95% attendance (and/or hitting a target per pupil based on individual attendance, or % improvement across a cohort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusion</td>
<td>Permanent exclusions</td>
<td>Reduction in school exclusions to 2011/12 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of perm exclusion</td>
<td>Reduction in fixed exclusion</td>
<td>Reduction in days lost to fixed term exclusion to 2011/12 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>For those “whose behaviour is unacceptable, who break school rules or who fail to follow a reasonable instruction (Section 91 of Education and Inspection Act 2006)”. Behaviour must improve to the standard of behaviour expected of pupils at the school as set out in the school behaviour policy.</td>
<td>that improvement in behaviour has been achieved; the period of the improvement, (including a minimum e.g. 13 week period of sustained improvement) Requires a signed and dated confirmation letter from school/teacher/home tutor on official headed paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion post school</td>
<td>A reduction in the number of young people who are NEET, or at risk of becoming NEET using school engagement, qualifications and NEETs data to measure progress of the group against expected activity.</td>
<td>Attainment; enrolment; employment, 6m, 12m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Conceptual Funding Model

PRU Conceptual Funding Model

PRU Model: Governance Process

School Exclusions

PIP/SIP/Inclusion Gateway

*Inclusion Gateway - decision & management via Localities