

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Scrutiny Review – Scoping and Planning Document

Title of the Review	How does the council provide support to children with Special Education Needs or Disabilities (SEND)
Panel Name	People Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Panel Members	Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Genevieve Gosling, George Shaw and John Story
Support Officer(s)	
Lead Member(s)/Officer(s) Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer	Councillor Mandy Brar Councillor Devon Davies
Relevant Cabinet Member	Councillor Amy Tisi – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education and Windsor
Purpose of the Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining? • Also being clear what the review is not looking at • What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve? • Where possible refer to VFM issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction. 	<p>There are a couple of goals in the RBWM Corporate Plan relating to children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that every child in the borough is able to experience positive outcomes in childhood, through healthy living, readiness to learn, and positive parenting, and support targeted at those most at risk. • An increase in the attainment ranking for Children in Care, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and children eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) in GCSE English and Maths. <p>These goals show that the borough wants to ensure that all children are able to thrive and achieve their potential. However,</p>

	<p>children with SEND and EHCPs require additional support from the council and schools.</p> <p>This review will look to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does RBWM currently use limited resources to achieve good outcomes for children with SEND? • Does the SEND Local Offer match the needs and difficulties faced by SEND children in the borough? • Are we reaching out to all residents to ensure that they know of the support available? • Are the parents, as well as the children, being supported appropriately? • How prepared is the council for future demand and strain on the service? • What improvements can be made to ensure that the support offer compliments the needs of SEND children in the borough?
<p>Criteria for Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny? • Which of the criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy? 	<p>Nationally, the number of children with SEND has increased and this has placed greater pressure on local authorities. The attainment gap between children with SEND and other children has increased, particularly over the course of the pandemic.</p> <p>The review will look to consider the range of support on offer for SEND children and whether there is data to confirm if all groups are being reached. Key performance indicators and metrics around attainment can be used by the Panel to assert whether support is helping to shorten the gap.</p>
<p>Terms of Reference</p>	<p>Single scrutiny item considered by the Panel. The report and SEND strategy can be reviewed and following discussion next steps can be confirmed.</p>

<p>What are the anticipated outcomes of the review?</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry</p> <p>Sources of Information/Evidence</p> <p>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</p>	<p>Do the priorities in the SEND strategy match the needs and priorities of children?</p> <p>How are we measuring these priorities?</p> <p>What are the key performance targets for the SEND strategy and are we achieving these targets? If not, why?</p>
<p>Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</p> <p>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</p>	<p>Need to ensure that all discussions are kept generic and that individual cases are not discussed.</p>
<p>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</p>	<p>Panel can make relevant recommendations to officers on reviewing the support offer available. If necessary, recommendations on the SEND strategy can be made to Cabinet.</p>
<p>What is the Review Timescale? • Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports, recommendations or decisions.</p>	<p>Agree scoping document.</p> <p>Item likely to be considered by the Panel later in the year.</p>
<p>How could a review be publicised?</p> <p>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement? • What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Flyers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</p>	<p>Through social media and newsletters.</p> <p>The Panel could appeal for parents of children with SEND to speak at a Panel meeting and share their experience.</p> <p>SENCO leads in schools, headteachers and governors would also be good sources of information for the review and could be invited as witnesses to the Panel meeting.</p>
<p>Completed by/ Date:</p>	<p>Councillor Mandy Brar</p> <p>Councillor Devon Davies</p> <p>Mark Beeley</p>
<p>Approved by Scrutiny Panel / Date:</p>	<p>People Overview and Scrutiny Panel – October 2023</p>

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Scrutiny Review – Scoping and Planning Document

Title of the Review	Home Education Support in RBWM
Panel Name	People Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Panel Members	Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Genevieve Gosling, George Shaw and John Story
Support Officer(s)	Lin Ferguson – Executive Director of Children’s Services and Education
Lead Member(s)/Officer(s) Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer	Councillor Jack Douglas Clive Haines – Deputy Director for Education
Relevant Cabinet Member	Councillor Amy Tisi – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education and Windsor
Purpose of the Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining? • Also being clear what the review is not looking at • What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve? • Where possible refer to VFM issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction. 	<p>The RBWM Corporate Plan has a target that:</p> <p>"At least 95% of the borough’s education settings are judged to be Good or Outstanding".</p> <p>This refers in the first instance to schools and other educational establishments - home education is too niche a topic to be addressed directly in the Corporate Plan. However, the same general principle can be inferred to apply to the home education setting and where the council has the capability, it should work towards helping parents achieve the home education analogy of 'good' or 'outstanding' education settings.</p> <p>Parents have the legal right to choose to educate their children other than by attendance at school, usually by providing</p>

	<p>education at home. In cases where a child is withdrawn from school, the Home Education team in the Education Welfare Service will then make initial contact with the family. AfC are committed to building trusting, positive relationships with parents.</p> <p>In other cases, the decision to keep a child out of school may not be known to RBWM and therefore the same level of support might not be provided.</p> <p>A review of the current situation would have two primary purposes, both focussed on supporting the best educational outcomes for children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding where AfC can offer useful low-cost assistance, beyond building trusting, positive relationships with parents. • Enabling the borough to intervene in cases where a home educated child is not receiving suitable education and AfC are currently unaware. <p>The review is not looking at the moral, legal, ethical or educational case for elective home education. It is assumed that choice and diversity are inherently a good thing and the balance of pros and cons are best weighed up by individual parents as the law provides.</p>
<p>Criteria for Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny? • Which of the criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy? 	<p>Four core principles have been established (by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny) to help people understand the most important qualities of scrutiny and accountability;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Constructive ‘critical friend’ challenge 2. Amplifies the voices and concerns of the public 3. Led by independent people who take responsibility for their role.

	<p>4. Drives improvement in public services</p> <p>This review will look to amplify the voices and concerns of the public by ensuring that there is adequate provision and support in place for those children in the borough who are home educated.</p> <p>The review will also look to drive improvement in public services, as parents could be supported with access to school exam halls or gym facilities.</p>
<p>Terms of Reference</p>	<p>A report could be considered by the Panel outlining the support and options available to parents who choose to home educate their children. The Panel would then have the opportunity to speak to officers and satisfy themselves that the council provides a comprehensive support package. Should gaps or areas of improvement be identified, recommendations can be made to Cabinet.</p>
<p>What are the anticipated outcomes of the review?</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry</p> <p>Sources of Information/Evidence</p> <p>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</p>	<p>Goals of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest ways to improve the data we collect on elective home education within the borough. • Suggest ways in which we can affordably assist with the education of home-educated children in the borough.
<p>Resource & budget requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specialist staff • any external support • site visits • consultation • research 	<p>None identified.</p> <p>Officer time and resource in preparing a report.</p>
<p>Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</p> <p>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</p>	<p>None identified.</p>
<p>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>

<p>What is the Review Timescale? • Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports, recommendations or decisions.</p>	<p>Scoping document agreed by the Panel.</p> <p>Item considered by People Overview and Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>Recommendations made to the Cabinet Member following consideration of the item.</p>
<p>How could a review be publicised?</p> <p>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement? • What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Flyers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</p>	<p>Review could be publicised through social media and the newsletter, residents with experience of home education could share their experience with the Panel and provide first hand evidence.</p>
<p>Completed by/ Date:</p>	<p>Councillor Jack Douglas</p> <p>Mark Beeley</p>
<p>Approved by Scrutiny Panel / Date:</p>	<p>People Overview and Scrutiny Panel – October 2023</p>