

SCHOOLS FORUM

THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 2021

At 2.00 pm

by

VIRTUAL MEETING - ONLINE ACCESS, ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
5.	<u>BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2021/22</u>	3 - 10
6.	<u>SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HEALTH FUTURE PROVISION</u>	11 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	No – Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Stuart Carroll - Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health
Meeting and Date:	Schools Forum 15 July 2021
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel - Director of Children’s Services James Norris - Head of Finance Achieving for Children (RBWM)
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Schools Forum with the projected financial position for 2021/22 along with a summary of associated Risks & Opportunities; the projected reserve deficit balance as at 31 March 2022 and an understanding of the financial pressures faced in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant. Details are set out in sections 2 and 3.
2. The Dedicated Schools Grant has a cumulative deficit position, therefore, it must work to mitigate this pressure including submitting a recovery plan to the Department for Education. The future action is set out in section 4.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 **RECOMMENDATION:** That Schools Forum notes the report including the reported variance, schedule of Risks & Opportunities and the projected deficit balance carried forward as at 31 March 2022.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

2.1 The Indicative Settlement for the Royal Borough for 2021/22 (including Academy schools) based on the March 2021 budget notification is £133,912,000. The net retained funding of £69,061,000 consists of £37,513,000 of maintained schools delegated budgets and £31,548,000 central schools budget (including Early Years and High Needs). Delegated budgets are treated as spent as soon as they are delegated, In addition it is expected that there will be a net in-year budget change of £672,000 in respect of the Early Years block mainly relating to the receipt of deferred Education Skills Funding Agency funding 2020/21.

2.2 The central schools budget has a projected overspend of £1,755,000 for 2021/22.

2.3 The material forecast variances are as follows:

- High Needs Block £1,755,000 - increased costs relating to the provision of Independent Special schools and other associated direct support. This forecast is reflective of the activity in 2020/21 along with updates to reflect known changes and the indicative increased volume of Education Health Care Plans. A more informed position will be confirmed in the autumn following the start of the new academic year when most pupils will be placed within the appropriate educational establishment. In addition to the recent increased demand for services for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, the COVID-19 pandemic has created additional challenges. These challenges could impact on the progress of some of our most vulnerable pupils. It is highly likely that there will be requests for pupils to repeat an academic year increasing the demand and pressure on this service area and sector.
- A further additional challenge already being evidenced is an increase in the number of parents opting to continue with “elective home education” for their children.

2.4 The material forecast risks and opportunities are as follows:

- Further to the Cabinet Report, 24th June 2021, in respect of the Windsor expansion programme the latest forecast assumes the schools block growth fund of £679,000 will be fully utilised. Further updates with options will be explored over the coming months; following this review any variance on this budget will be incorporated as appropriate into the monitoring position.

2.5 Table 1 sets out the summarised financial position for 2021/22

Table 1 Summarised Financial Position 2021/22

Schools Block Budget	S251 Budget Notification (March 2021)	Less Academy Recoupment & Direct Funding	Net Budget Notification (March 2021)	DfE & Indicative In-Year Budget Changes	Current Budget	Forecast Variance	Current Forecast
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Expenditure							
Schools	99,611	(62,098)	37,513	0	37,513	0	37,513
Central School Services	1,097	0	1,097	0	1,097	0	1,097
Early Years	9,025	0	9,025	672	9,697	0	9,697
High Needs	24,180	(2,753)	21,426	0	21,426	1,755	23,181
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	133,912	(64,852)	69,061	672	69,733	1,755	71,488

Funding							
Dedicated Schools Grant	(133,912)	64,852		(672)	(69,733)	0	(69,733)
TOTAL FUNDING	(133,912)	64,852		(672)	(69,733)	0	(69,733)
NET EXPENDITURE	0	0		0	0	1,755	1,755
	Summary					£000	
	Total in year (surplus) / deficit					1,755	
	Balance brought forward DSG general reserve (surplus) / deficit					1,791	
	Net Projected (surplus) /deficit					3,546	

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 3.1 The net in-year overspend is an adverse movement on the dedicated schools grant general reserve which as at 31st March 2021 was a net deficit of £1,791,000 including (DSG earmarked reserves of £134,000); the revised deficit as at 31st March 2022 is projected to increase by £1,755,000 to £3,546,000.
- 3.2 The projected cumulative deficit for RBWM is 2.6% of the total budget allocation.
- 3.3 As previously reported to the Schools Forum 21 January 2021, it is a requirement for any local authority that has an overall deficit on its DSG account at the end of the financial year, or whose DSG surplus has substantially reduced during the year, to co-operate with the Department for Education (DfE) in handling that situation. In particular, the local authority must:
- Provide information as and when requested by the department about its plans for managing its DSG account in future financial years
 - Provide information as and when requested by the department about pressures and potential savings on its High Needs budget
 - Meet with officials of the department as and when they request to discuss the local authority's plans and financial situation
 - Keep the Schools Forum regularly updated about the local authority's DSG account and plans for handling it, including High Needs pressures and potential savings
- 3.4 There is no single approach to developing and delivering a successful Deficit Management Plan, however, a successful plan needs to have effective, coordinated and well-executed leadership and management which impacts positively on organisational culture and means that organisational performance is strong and consistent. It also requires engagement from a variety of stakeholder groups including school leaders and other partner organisations.
- 3.5 There have been a number of key themes identified to be considered that will lead to a reduction in costs. The main themes are set out below:
- Block transfers - funding realignment
 - Review exiting Specialist Resource Provision
 - Open new Resource units
 - Improved commissioning including annual reviews, inflation negotiations
 - Increased contributions from partners
 - Local SEND place sufficiency plan

- Post 16 pathway planning and proactive promotion of vocational pathways
- Annually review the use and value for money of notional SEN funding with evidence that it is being used built into processes
- Review of High Needs Block activities for cost effectiveness
- Review other block expenditure budgets for value for money and to ensure they support priorities

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The financial implications are set out in sections 2 and 3. The overall impact is a projected carried forward deficit on the Dedicated Schools Grant as at 31 March 2022 of £3,546,000.
- 4.2 This is a national challenge, with many authorities reporting a projected carried forward deficit by 31 March 2022. Those with the most significant balances are entering into a “safety valve” agreement with the DfE where the authority undertakes to reach a positive in-year balance on its Dedicated Schools Grant. The authority undertakes to control and reduce the cumulative deficit in line with the financial plan as submitted and funding assumptions as agreed with the DfE.
- 4.3 Local authorities are required to carry forward overspends to their schools budget either in the immediately following year or the year after.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

6. RISK MANAGMENT

- 6.1 There are no potential risks arising from this report, however, the requirement from the DfE is RBWM/AfC will agree a Deficit Management Plan to address the cumulative deficit position in the short to medium term.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](#). The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups, have been considered. It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report. Link to Equality Impact Assessments. <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/council-and-democracy/equalities-and-diversity/equality-impact-assessments>

- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

8.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:

- Schools revenue funding 2021/22 Operational guide
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2021-to-2022>

9. CONSULTATION

9.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report.

10. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

10.1 There is no timetable for implementation of any actions arising from this report.

11. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

12. RISK MANAGEMENT

12.1 There are no potential risks arising from this report, however, the requirement from the DfE is RBWM/AfC will agree a Deficit Management Plan to address the cumulative deficit position in the short to medium term.

13. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 13.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](#). The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups, have been considered. It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report. Link to Equality Impact Assessments. <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/council-and-democracy/equalities-and-diversity/equality-impact-assessments>
- 13.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.

13.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

14. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

14.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:

- Schools revenue funding 2021/22 Operational guide
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2021-to-2022>

15. CONSULTATION

15.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report.

16. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

16.1 There is no timetable for implementation of any actions arising from this report.

17. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Cllr Stuart Carroll	Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health	29-06-21	07-07-21
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive	29-06-21	02-07-21
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	29-06-21	07-07-21
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	29-06-21	07-07-21
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Children's Services	29-06-21	29-06-21
Hilary Hall	Executive Director Adults, Health and Housing	29-06-21	30-06-21
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance	29-06-21	07-07-21
Elaine Browne	Head of Law	29-06-21	30-06-21
Emma Duncan	Deputy Director of Law & Strategy / Monitoring Officer	29-06-21	29-06-21
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	29-06-21	29-06-21
Louisa Dean	Communications	29-06-21	29-06-21
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance	29-06-21	30-06-21

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To Follow item?
For information	No	No
Report Author: James Norris - Head of Finance Achieving for Children (RBWM)		

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) future provision
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	No – Part I
Lead Member:	Councillor Stuart Carroll - Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health
Meeting and Date:	Schools Forum 15 July 2021
Responsible Officer(s):	Helen Huntley – SEND Consultant and Clive Haines School Leadership Development Manager.
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is:

- To provide the Schools Forum with an update about the consultation with Headteachers regarding the provision for Children and Young People (C&YP) with a Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulty.
- To ask Schools Forum to comment on the proposals to develop a range of interventions and provision resulting from this consultation.
- To ask Schools Forum to note that the implementation of any provision will require changes to the use of Designated School Grant (DSG) funding and will be subject to further decisions of the council and Schools Forum.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

1.1 RECOMMENDATION: That Schools Forum notes the report and

- Comments on the proposals set out in section 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10.**
- Provides guidance on the potential funding options as set up in 4.2 to allow a further report for 2022/23 budget setting which set outs recommendations as to how the intervention and provision can be paid for on a sustainable basis.**

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Context.

- 2.1 Schools in RBWM are experiencing a rise in the number of C&YP who have a Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulty, one of the four areas of SEN identified in the 2014 Code of Practice. This is evidenced by the number of C&YP who are being referred for a formal assessment and receiving an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) with SEMH identified as the primary need. Another form of evidence has been the increasing numbers of young people who are being permanently excluded from RBWM primary and

secondary schools. Of particular concern is the age of the pupils who are presenting challenging behaviours. This is getting younger and has resulted in the permanent exclusion (PEX) of 7 primary aged children in 2018/9. The pandemic has added to schools' concerns and there is much discussion about the increasing numbers of C&YP whose mental health has been negatively impacted over this period.

2.2 As a result of this, the Local Authority has been in discussion with headteachers to review the current support available to schools, including the SEMH Intervention Programme funded by the Schools Forum until March 2022. Following the review, we considered ways in which the most effective support is available at the right time, for this cohort of young people.

2.3 In addition to this consultation, the Area Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCo) and the Education Psychology (EP) service has been working closely with schools as they support pupils returning to full time education following partial school closures. This has included sharing resources and good practice through the SENCo networks and SENCo bulletin, which has been well received by school staff. The EP service has led the training on the 'well-being return for education' agenda whilst the Wellbeing team has been supporting schools with the roll out of the Mental Health Team in Schools initiative which is currently in 14 schools within the Borough. The EP service have also led on the development of a toolkit to support schools in managing the needs of pupils who have 'Emotionally Related School Avoidance'. This is currently being piloted in several local schools and will be shared with wider schools at the next SENCo leadership forum.

2.4 Review of current SEMH focused provision

Service	Commentary	Review
The Behaviour Support Service.	1.8 members of staff.	To access this support referrals are made to Early Help. This has resulted in too long a waiting time from the initial referral to the receipt of support. Work that has been particularly valued by schools has been the support for nurture and transition.
SEMH Outreach Service	SEMH Coordinator and three SEMH Coach Mentors.	This has been running since September 2019 and is fully funded until April 2022. See <i>Appendix 1</i> for a review of the service. This highlights the reduction in primary school exclusions and the benefits of targeted training which has been well received by schools.
Provision in a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) for those excluded from school.	Haybrook College is currently commissioned to deliver this service for all ages	Contracted for 35 places, 5 are for primary aged pupils. The cost for each place per year is £17,500. £10,000 base funding plus a £7,500 "top up" when a pupil is placed. It is recognised that this works well for secondary aged pupils. However, currently Haybrook College has to commission other Alternative Provision (AP) providers to deliver the primary element of the contract as this is not appropriate from the College site in Slough.

Known as RISE.		
Special school provision	RBWM does not have a dedicated SEMH Special school.	Spot purchasing of places in Out of Borough (OOB) LA schools (£30,000 pa per pupil) and non-maintained special schools (£60,000 pa per pupil) for C&YP with the most complex SEMH needs.

Recommendations and developments following the discussion between Headteachers and the LA.

- 2.5 Following a series of meeting with Headteachers, a Statement of Intent has been drafted which outlines the joint belief in how schools and the LA should be working together to support this particularly vulnerable group of C&YP. Please see *Appendix 2*.
- 2.6 The key focus for this statement is:
- The importance of early intervention and prevention. Once a C&YP is in PRU or a specialist SEMH setting, returning to mainstream education is increasingly unlikely. Provision to support primary aged pupils, as young as three or four, is a priority. There is also a need to provide early intervention for pupils of all ages as soon as challenging behaviour is identified. This enables professionals to react quickly and prevent or reduce the risk of any further escalation leading to a fixed term or permanent exclusion and the resulting need for a specialist placement.
 - The importance of working with the families of the C&YP with an SEMH difficulty and the need for joined up working, particularly with Early Intervention and the wellbeing team.
 - The need for high quality training for school staff to support the identification of a SEMH need as well as practical strategies to ensure high quality interventions within the classroom.
- 2.7 Reflecting these values, the Headteachers and Local Authority created a list of suggestions of what provision and interventions should be available to support C&YP with an additional SEMH difficulty. Please see *Appendix 3*. This support is presented under the 3 headings:
- Universal support: services that are routinely available to all C&YP
 - Targeted support: services that are available to C&YP with an additional SEMH need.
 - Specialist support: services for C&YP who have a SEMH EHCP and those who have been permanently excluded.
- 2.8 The creation of a range of **universal** provision including an SEMH Network which will include an SEMH@AfC email address to provide guidance and signposting support. The universal provision would also include access to a Boxall Online Profile for all settings from Sept 2021. This online assessment tool will enable the consistent and early identification of a SEMH need as well as providing suggested interventions which are then monitored and evaluated. This will cost £16,900 this year and the LA has been able to fund for 2021/22.

- 2.9 The creation of a series of Hubs (Early Years, primary and secondary) to provide **targeted** support. These would not be a Resource Provision or an SEN Unit so that pupils without EHCP's can be supported. The pupil remains on the roll of the "home" school while the Hub provides a service.
- 2.10 The creation of an SEMH Outreach service from Easter 2022 through the retention of the SEMH Intervention Service and the amalgamation of this with the Behaviour Support Service (BSS). This service will work closely with schools and the Hubs to provide **targeted** support so that more C&YP remain in mainstream settings.
- 2.11 A longer-term discussion around the value of developing **specialist** places, through a SEMH special school within RBWM.

Summarised Risks & Opportunities.

- 2.12 The paper in the Autumn will consider the way such services could be funded, including consideration of savings that could be made because of earlier intervention through the effective deployment of the Outreach service and the use of the Hubs.

This could include savings from:

- Removing the primary places from the RISE contract
- Fewer places being commissioned in OOB specialist provision or in non-maintained special schools.
- Fewer C&YP requiring a fulltime placement in Alternative Provision or a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

There is also the potential of cost avoidance by fewer EHCPs being issued for pupils with a SEMH prime need in the longer term.

- 2.13 In addition, the following risks to be considered are:
- Additional pressures on other RBWM services such as Early Help and Social care.
 - A deterioration in the wellbeing of the RBWM's school staff, particularly the Headteachers.
- 2.13 These Invest to save initiatives could have a significant impact on the performance of RBWM schools. These initiatives demonstrate:
- i) Our close working relationship with schools. We are listening to their concerns and valuing their opinion.
 - ii) Our solution focused response to challenging circumstances as we are creating a range of intervention and provision at Universal, Targeted and Specialist levels.

3. NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 A further report will be provided for Schools Forum in time for the 2022/23 budget setting. This will set out recommendations as to how the intervention and provision can be paid for from April 2022. This will require a review of the trends driving the expenditure in the High Needs block while driving for a balanced in-year budget.

3.2 All services currently funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant will be in scope of this review, specifically including the opportunity to consider the retention of the SEMH Intervention Service and the joint working with the Behaviour Support Service (BSS).

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 The paper in the Autumn will ask Schools Forum to consider different ways in which the proposed interventions and provision can be paid for at a time when there is increasing pressures, particularly on the High Needs Block (HNB).

4.2 Revenue funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant is split into four blocks: Early Years, Schools Devolved, High Needs and Centrally retained. All have a range of regulations governing how they can be used and Forum representatives are asked to seek views from their groups on the potential of using the following approaches to fund SEMH services in the future:

- **Direct funding** from the HNB – which will mean stopping other directly funded services.
- A **block transfer** from another block to the HNB – this will mean a reduction in the source block to give more budget for the new services
- A **specific agreement to fund the service from delegated budgets** – in effect an insurance premium approach to ensure a set capacity is available and will require the agreement of all parties
- A **buy-back arrangement** where individual schools make an up front payment to be able to access the service – this limits the capacity of the service and may disadvantage schools with the larger likely need
- **Pay as you go** arrangements – this puts the setup costs onto the HNB and would add a level of transactional commitment to the arrangement.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 Provision that does not meet the need for an increasing number of children will result in poorer outcomes. Development of these services will lower that risk and provide support to our schools.

6.2 The proposed services have to be funded and there is insufficient funding within the DSG for the services to all be additional. By assessing the willingness of the Forum to use different funding options, a plan which enables delivery can be developed.

6.3 The overall DSG envelope is currently running a deficit and the local authority is required to develop a plan which ensures in year balanced spending as a minimum and a recovery of the deficit over 3-5 years. This service allows potential long-term reductions in the pressure on the HNB.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equality Impact Assessments. At this stage where the ideas are being proposed for a group with specific needs there is no need for an EqIA until there are decisions about the final scale and implications.
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 8.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:
- Appendix 1 – SEMH Intervention Programme Report.
 - Appendix 2 – Draft Joint Statement of Intent.
 - Appendix 3 – Summary: Prioritising possible SEMH interventions/provision.

9. CONSULTATION

9.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report.

10. TIMETABLE FOR IMPEMENTATION

10.1 The subsequent report for decisions will be developed for an Autumn Schools Forum meeting.

11. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Cllr Stuart Carroll	Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health	30-06-21	07-07-21
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive	30-06-21	02-07-21
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	30-06-21	07-07-21
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	30-06-21	07-07-21
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Children’s Services	29-06-21	29-06-21

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Hilary Hall	Executive Director Adults, Health and Housing	30-06-21	30-06-21
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance	30-06-21	07-07-21
Elaine Browne	Head of Law	30-06-21	30-06-21
Emma Duncan	Deputy Director of Law & Strategy / Monitoring Officer	30-06-21	30-06-21
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	30-06-21	06-07-21
Louisa Dean	Communications	30-06-21	30-06-21
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance	30-06-21	30-06-21

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To Follow item?
Schools Forum For information	No	No
Report Author: Helen Huntley – SEND Consultant AI Whitelaw – SEMH Coordinator		

Appendix 1

Update and impact for the SEMH intervention programme for preventing exclusions within the primary schools and the ongoing pilot project within the secondary schools.

The project centres on 2 aspects.

- Support around a child (no EHCP) at risk of permanent exclusions.
- Building capacity within the school.

We were commissioned to support 32 primary/middle schools (2 Schools per half term) up until March 2022. Currently we have supported 26 schools.

- **17 Primary Schools:** *Woodlands Park, Riverside, Cookham Rise, Alexander First, St Edmund Campion, Wessex, Larchfield, All Saints, Courthouse, Furze*

Platt Primary, Dedworth Green First, Wraysbury, St Francis, Alwyn Infants, Cheapside, Queen Anne First, Furze Platt Infants.

- **3 Middle Schools:** *Dedworth Middle, Trevelyan. St Edwards Middle.*
- **6 Secondary Schools:** *Churchmead, Desborough, Charters, Altwood. Cox Green, Furze Platt Snr*

The intervention duration of the 2 schools during coronavirus lockdown 1 (*Dedworth Middle and Courthouse*) was extended a full term and support was delivered in a variety of creative ways. Consequently, the project was unable to support the 4 potential schools during the Summer Term 2020.

Support around the child:

- Have supported 20 children in Primary/Middle schools (17 boys / 3 girls).
 - 3x Reception
 - 5x Yr 1
 - 1x Yr 2
 - 3x Yr 3
 - 1x Yr 4
 - 4x Yr 5
 - 2x Yr 6
 - 1x Yr 7
- We have supported 10 children in secondary school (7 boys / 3 girls)
 - 1x Yr 7
 - 3x Yr 8
 - 3x Yr 9
 - 3x Yr 10
- Each child Risk Assessment and BESST (Behaviour Emotional Social, Self and Teaching/Learning) as baseline and to track progress (x 3) *Progress data available.*
- Provide a cycle of Assess Plan Do Review information to support.
- All received 1 - 3 home visits to support family and build relationships.
- Daily contact with Parent/Carer.
- Continued support ½ term post project (primary).
- Potential £3,000 financial support for Resources and Intervention. *Information on deployment and impact available*
- 2 SEMH Mentors have been retained by the school following the intervention.
- 2 schools have taken the SEMH Mentor model and recruited learning mentors.
- 1 child has been supported as part of a in year transition to new school.
- 1 child has been supported with therapeutic intervention whilst EHCP and new provision secured.
- **No child that has been subject to the provision has been permanently excluded.**

Building Capacity within the school

- SEMH Training - As of **16/06/21** we have delivered SEMH training to **667** staff across **31** schools and training for NQTs/Learning Mentors. Flexible delivery. ½ day inset / 2 twilight sessions / TA and Teacher split. All training positively received - overall feedback from participants average **4.6 out of 5.**
- SEMH Coach/Mentor models strategies across school (can work with other pupils / staff during transition phase).
- SEMH Coach/Mentor coach specific staff as identified by the Head Teacher to embed high quality inclusive practice.
- Policies review (if requested/necessary).

- Paperwork – Behaviour Support Plans / Risk Assessments / Physical Intervention reporting etc.
- Empowering staff results in less time impact for SLT dealing with behaviour concerns.
- Measurable impact on schools apparent in the Evaluation feedback which takes place ½ term post intervention. 18/20 Head Teachers responded that the project achieved objectives. 2/20 Head Teachers responded that the project partially achieved its objectives.

The project has remained on budget and accrued sufficient savings to enable the pilot of the secondary model. The delegated budget comes to an end in March 2022.

Below is a table showing total number of PEx within RBWM primary schools.

2017/18	1
2018/19	7
2019/20	5
2020/21	1
2021/22 (UTD)	0

Appendix 2

Meeting the needs of Children and Young People (C&YP) with Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties

Joint Statement of Intent.

We believe in:

Responsibility	It is the responsibility of the LA and all its schools to ensure that the correct support is in place for C&YP with SEMH needs
Belonging	It is crucial for the wellbeing of C&YP that they belong to their school community. Once a pupil feels loved, they feel safe and

	then they will be able to learn. The quality of the relationships we develop and the language we use can reinforce this feeling of belonging
Trauma awareness	Behaviour is a form of communication and challenging behaviours are often the consequence of significant anxieties and traumas. It is the responsibility of schools and services to recognise and respond to this.
Systemic support in schools	The most effective support is one which is systemic and holistic; it focuses on the capacity within the school to manage a range of need rather than a focus on a particular child. Once the needs of pupils with SEMH are being effectively met within our schools, the learning of all pupils will be maximised.
Multi agency working	A multiagency response which supports the need of C&YP and their families will be more effective.
A voice for all	Listening to the voice of C&YP and their families without judgement is likely to enhance our understanding of their needs.

We will endeavour to:

- Provide C&YP with SEMH with a place in a RBWM school
- Make school curricula informed by the needs of all C&YP in our school communities including those with an SEMH needs
- Prioritise High Quality Teaching to C&YP with SEMH. Any Reasonable adjustments made are likely to support the emotional well-being of all pupils
- Focus on prevention rather than exclusion
- Embed a graduated response to the needs of pupils with SEMH in our schools
- Identify an SEMH need as early as possible so that effective intervention can be implemented
- Make high quality Alternative Provision available as an intervention to support the inclusion all pupils who require additional support at a particular time
- Train staff to meet the needs of C&YP with a range of SEMH needs
- Prioritise transition support
- Ensure effective communication to enable a collaborative approach to supporting C&YP with SEMH needs

**Consultation between RBWM Headteachers and Local Authority staff.
Summary: Prioritising possible SEMH Interventions /provision**

Intervention / strategy
Universal
Borough wide approach to Nurture: Similar to that developed in Glasgow.
Boxhall Profile (Online): The use of this system to support the early identification of pupils with SEMH and to support transition between settings.
SEMH Network: The creation of a network (mirroring the SENCo / DSL network).
Parental support / training: The co-production of a training programme (PaCiP / schools / LA services) for the parents of C&YP with SEMH.
Parental support: Greater access to Early Help / family Liaison Officer to support the families of C&YP with SEMH and who are at risk of exclusion.
“Red phone line”: SEMH emergency email address / phone number which ensures that someone from the LA returns a call on the same day or early the next day.
Reviews: multiagency reviews of PEx to examine what lessons we can learn from them. This will include examining if their EHCP assessment was too late.
Training for schools: Extending support / training offered by Virtual school to all schools for all pupils. More SEMH training (Attachment, Nurture, ELSA, Creating Climate, Trauma awareness etc).
Targeted.
Early Years SEMH Intervention: The creation of an intervention service to support 4-year-olds who are not “School ready”.
SEMH Hub: Creation of a SEMH Hub which RBWM schools can access “respite” provision. Could this “house” primary aged PEX pupils?
Creation of an SEMH Outreach service reflecting the SHINE model: A pool of trained and experienced SCM available for schools to buy in to.
Traffic light (RAG) system: The creation of a system to RAG rate pupils at risk of PEX by LA services.
Creation on SEMH Alternative provision interventions.
Specialist
SEMH Resource Provision: The creation of a SEMH Resource Provision or SEN Unit attached to a RBWM school for pupils with a SEMH ECC Plan.
SEMH Special school: Creation of a SEMH Special school within RBWM
Other comments: The following were taken out as there was insufficient support for them to be included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C Poms (more CP and quite expensive) ○ Transition paperwork (Not needed if other things in place - particularly the online Boxall assessment tool. ○ Subsidised counselling service. (Heads wanted to focus on preventative)

This page is intentionally left blank