

# Public Document Pack

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling please ask for:

Natalie Jones-Punch on 033 022 25098  
Email: natalie.jones-punch@westsussex.gov.uk

www.westsussex.gov.uk

County Hall  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RQ  
Switchboard  
Tel no (01243) 777100



31 December 2019

## Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee

A meeting of the committee will be held at **10.00 am** on **Thursday, 9 January 2020** at **County Hall, Chichester**.

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

**The meeting will be available to view live via the Internet at this address:**

<http://www.westsussex.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

### Agenda

- |          |    |   |
|----------|----|---|
| 10.00 am | 1. | <p><b>Declarations of Interests</b></p> <p>Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt please contact Democratic Services before the meeting.</p> |
| 10.00 am | 2. | <p><b>Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee</b> (Pages 5 - 10)</p> <p>The Committee is asked to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2019 (cream paper).</p>  |
| 10.05 am | 3. | <p><b>Urgent Matters</b></p> <p>Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances, including cases where the Committee needs to be informed of budgetary or performance issues affecting matters within its terms of reference, which have emerged since the publication of the agenda.</p>                        |
| 10.05 am | 4. | <p><b>Responses to Recommendations</b> (Pages 11 - 12)</p> <p>The Committee is asked to note the responses to recommendations made at the 4 December 2019 meeting from</p>  |

the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills – to follow.

- 10.10 am      5.      **Forward Plan of Key Decisions** (Pages 13 - 24)
- Extract from the Forward Plan dated 27 December 2019 – attached.
- An extract from any Forward Plan published between the date of despatch of the agenda and the date of the meeting will be tabled at the meeting.

The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to enquire into any of the forthcoming decisions within its portfolio.

- 10.15 am      6.      **Report from the Small Schools Task and Finish Group** (Pages 25 - 28)

Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.

The Committee are asked to consider and discuss the recommendations of the TFG and agree a response to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, prior to decision by Cabinet.

- 10.35 am      7.      **Small Schools Proposals** (Pages 29 - 58)

Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.

The Committee is asked to consider the draft Cabinet decision report and provide comment to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills prior to the formal decision being taken.

- 11.35 am      8.      **School Funding 2020/21** (Pages 59 - 72)

Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.

The Committee is asked to consider the draft decision report and provide comment to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills prior to the formal decision being taken.

**The Committee will break for lunch for 30 minutes at 12.20**

- 12.50 pm      9.      **Children First Improvement Update** (Pages 73 - 84)

Report by the Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning.

The report updates the Committee on developments in the Children First Programme since its last meeting in December.

- 1.50 pm      10.      **Business Planning Group Report** (Pages 85 - 90)

The report informs the Committee of the Business Planning

Group meeting held on 25 November 2019, setting out the key issues discussed.

The Committee is asked to endorse the contents of this report, and particularly the Committee's Work Programme revised to reflect the Business Planning Group's discussions (attached at Appendix A).

2.00 pm      11.      **Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**

Members to mention any items which they believe to be of relevance to the business of the Select Committee, and suitable for scrutiny, e.g. raised with them by constituents arising from central government initiatives etc.

If any member puts forward such an item, the Committee's role at this meeting is just to assess, briefly, whether to refer the matter to its Business Planning Group (BPG) to consider in detail.

2.05 pm      12.      **Requests for Call-In**

There have been no requests for call-in to the Select Committee and within its constitutional remit since the date of the last meeting. The Director of Law and Assurance will report any requests since the publication of the agenda papers.

2.05 pm      13.      **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 4 March 2020 at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Any member wishing to place an item on the agenda for the meeting must notify the Director of Law and Assurance by 21 February 2020.

**To all members of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee**

**Webcasting**

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the County Council's website on the internet - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes by the Council.

Generally the public gallery is not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.



## **Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee**

4 December 2019 – At a meeting of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall North, Horsham.

Present: Mr Barling (Chairman)

Mr Baldwin	Mr Hillier	Mrs Roberts
Mr Barnard	Mrs Jones	Mr Wickremaratchi
Mrs Burgess	Mr Lea	Ms Sudan
Ms Flynn	Ms Lord	
Mrs Hall	Mr Lozzi	

Apologies were received from Mrs Bridges, Mr Cristin and Mrs Ryan

Absent:

Also in attendance: Mr Marshall, Mr Jupp and Mrs Russell

### **Part I**

#### **45. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee**

45.1 The Committee received a tabled updated version of the minutes from 23 October 2019.

45.2 Resolved – that the minutes of the last meeting held on 23 October 2019 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### **46. Responses to Recommendations**

46.1 Resolved that the Committee note the response.

#### **47. Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

47.1 The Committee considered a tabled paper which was a new version of the Forward Plan dated 2 December 2019 (copy appended to the signed minutes). This version of the Forward Plan was not included in the Committee papers as it had been published following the statutory despatch of the agenda.

47.2 Resolved that the Committee notes the Forward Plan.

#### **48. Children First Improvement Update**

48.1 The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning. The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People advised that the statutory responsibility for the portfolio had now transferred to herself from the Leader.

48.2 The Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning provided the following update on the Children First Improvement plans:

- Ofsted were currently undertaking their first monitoring visit which focussed examination on Assessment and Intervention and the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO), amongst the wider position of Children's Services since the inspection. The outcome of this visit should be reportable at the January meeting of the Committee.
- Stable progress had been made regarding the workforce, and the vacancy gap was at 2.3%.
- Agency staff made up 15% of the workforce, which was comparable with neighbouring authorities.
- Garath Symonds, Senior Improvement Lead, advised the Committee of a 'better use of technology' project to enable best practice within the service through Windows 10 rollout and systems improvement and integration.
- Ann Marie Dodds, Assistant Director Early Help advised that work was underway in the areas of private fostering and youth homelessness. This included appropriate training, awareness raising, work with districts and boroughs and ensuring children and young people understand their rights and entitlements.

The Committee considered the following points in discussion:

- Members asked for the current number of Children Looked After within the service. The Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning advised the figure was currently just over 700.
- The Committee considered how the service monitored independent children's homes. The Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning advised every independent agency was regulated by Ofsted, and that WSCC had a small commissioning contracts and placements team who monitored the quality of external placement providers.
- Members of the Committee noted the successes of the recruitment and retention offer but queried what the service were doing in terms of contingency planning when the 18 month commitment period to WSCC ended. The Assistant Director Early Help advised a root and branch review of the Early Help offer would take place which would likely impact the service requirements as a whole. The Senior Improvement Lead advised the business continuity plan was also being reviewed.
- Members noted that 22 children in a private fostering arrangement in September 2019 seemed very low. The Assistant Director Early Help agreed and that raising awareness was crucial. Awareness raising had been undertaken with partners such as health, schools and the Local Safeguarding Children's Partnership (LSCP).

48.3 Resolved that the Committee:

1. Requests a report to the March BPG on recruitment and retention of staff plans going forward.
2. Notes the Children First Improvement Update.

## 49. Woodlands Meed

49.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Property and Assets and the Director of Education and Skills. The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills to provide an opening statement to the Committee, who heard the following:

- Since becoming Cabinet Member, Woodlands Meed had been amongst the most important issues for the portfolio and acknowledged the long and difficult history.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills had visited Woodlands Meed school and college on three occasions, met with the Headteacher, Chair of Governors and lead organiser for the Complete Woodlands Meed campaign. He also attended the Central and South Mid-Sussex County Local Committee in November where the topic was discussed.
- In anticipation of a decision being made in the new year, the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills was minded to recommend to Cabinet colleagues that WSCC honour the commitment made in February 2019 for investment in the Woodlands Meed site, subject to an independent report on the suitability of the building and its ability to meet the needs of pupils. IT was hoped this report would be ready by the end of January 2020.
- The Cabinet Member added that during the last six weeks he had visited the majority of the county council's special schools which cater for over 60% of SEND pupils. He had been struck by the commitment, skill and compassion of staff, parents, governors and leads in those schools.

49.2 The Chairman invited Paul Wagstaff, Director of Education and Skills to introduce the report. The Committee heard the following key points:

- The need to improve facilities at Woodlands Meed had been discussed over a long period of time, and it was recognised that the current site would not meet the needs required into the future.
- The SEND and Inclusion Strategy 2016 -19 noted the requirement for additional places in order to reduce the need to place children externally. Greater analysis has now shown that there was far more availability for post-16 students with SEND currently than there was previously, including the commissioning of 550 places into further education institutions, with an aim to continue to increase those places.
- The Director of Education and Skills recognised Woodlands Meed as a crucial provider of education for children with SEND, however, advised that there was no current requirement to either expand or reduce provision.
- The new SEND and Inclusion Strategy 2019-2024 focussed on providing additional specialist places closer to where children live.
- Extensive discussions over recent years between the governing body and officers had considered options to expand the current site at Woodlands Meed, to refurbish or re-build entirely.
- Jerry Dillon, Development and Capital Advisor, advised there were now four options for the site as laid out in the report:

- Option 1 – a 100 pupil place new build constructed on the playing field and the original building being demolished.
- Option 2 – a 136 pupil place new build, existing site demolished.
- Option 3 – a 136 pupil place new build, decanting pupils into temporary accommodation and building onto the existing site.
- Option 4 – replacement of existing modular accommodation.
- The primary challenge for some of the options was the issue of access to the site during building works.
- The Director of Education and Skills advised the proposal was to commission an independent specialist survey which would provide a baseline against which the four options could be considered for Cabinet decision.

49.3 The Chairman invited Marion Wilcock, Chair of Governor's at Woodlands Meed, and Karen George, Lead of the Complete Woodlands Meed campaign, to address the Committee who heard the following:

- The current building did not meet statutory requirements.
- The land and buildings were owned by the governing body, who have responsibility for the education of students, and for the suitability of the buildings.
- This issue had been ongoing for almost ten years.
- A further consultation or survey was not required, WSCC had all the information required; further delay was not justified.
- WSCC were not honouring their statutory duty and gave an undertaking in 2017 to the Department for Education (DfE) in 2017 that they would comply.
- £20m was committed in February 2019 to improve the school, option 1 identified in the report was within that budget.
- This was not about additional places, but for catering to the needs of existing children. It seemed WSCC had a blatant disregard for vulnerable children.
- The school was currently unable to accommodate some children which was in breach of the Equality Act. Access to classrooms was difficult for some children. There was one wheelchair accessible toilet. There were heating issues, which for children with sensory issues made the environment intolerable.
- The Chair of Governors and Complete Woodlands Meed Campaign Lead implored WSCC to deliver on the promise made ten years ago.
- The Committee heard from Jamie Fitzjohn, the County Council's disabled member champion, who stressed the importance of quality education in a positive community setting, and explained how the needs of children should be put first to enable them the best start in life.

49.4 The Committee considered the following points in discussion:

- The Chairman asked the Development and Capital Advisor what the structure of the school was made of. He advised it was a wood type structure and was building regulations compliant. The Chair of

Governor's advised laminate panelling was present at the school which presented as a particular risk.

- The Chairman asked if the associated cost for option 1 of £18,630,000 was inclusive of all costs or just the building work. The Development and Capital Advisor confirmed this was the total cost. The Chairman asked how long the process from planning application to completed building would take and heard it was likely to be in the region of 23 months from start to finish.
- Members familiar to the site agreed the fabric of the buildings and facilities were poor. They urged the service and Cabinet Member to cease delays and deliver the project.
- Members considered the report and noted it did not seem to be a wholly factual representation of the situation. They also sought clarification on whether this was an education or finance portfolio decision. Members also sought to understand what changed from the February 2019 £20m commitment and why now an independent review was required.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills advised in February 2019 £20m was allocated to Woodlands Meed subject to an anticipated government grant of £6m, which had not been received. The Chairman asked if an option seeking expenditure over £14m was selected, would the Cabinet Member endeavour to bridge the funding gap. The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills he was attempting to do this.
- Members were unsure what more would be achieved by a further independent review. They also considered that whilst it was helpful to educate SEND children in Special Support Centre's (SSCs) in mainstream schools, that special schools were still important and required.
- The Leader advised the Committee that Woodlands Meed was a challenge and thanked the Chair of Governor's, Complete Woodlands Meed campaign and parents and carers. He added that this was a difficult narrative to understand but that it was frustrating and embarrassing not to have a clear steer after such lengthy dialogues over years about the site. The Leader agreed with members comments that the report was not of excellent quality and that the level of care and education SEND children receive should be better. He added that this would eventually be a collective Cabinet decision, and that therefore an independent specialist report was critical to inform such a decision.

#### 49.5 Resolved that the Committee:

1. Requests that there is a firm decision made by January 2020.
2. Felt that only options 1 and 2 should be considered, with a preference for option 2 (136 pupil place new build). Option 4 should not be considered.
3. Felt there was no need for a further independent specialist survey to be undertaken.
4. Requests that the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills use his best endeavours with Cabinet colleagues to bridge any funding gap if option 1 or option 2 is agreed upon.
5. Requests that any problem of access to the site for construction work is overcome.

**50. Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**

50.1 The Committee requested Elective Home Education as an item for future scrutiny. Members were advised this was on the BPG agenda for March.

50.2 The Committee asked for a meeting on mental health. Rachel Allan, Senior Advisor Democratic Services, advised she was working with the youth cabinet to schedule this as a takeover day, and that further details would be provided when available. Members requested this also included how schools dealt with mental health.

50.3 Members of the Committee asked for information on support for families and parents who cared for children looked after. The Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning suggested he take this away and come back to the BPG with a proposal on how to tackle this. He added this could include transitions to adulthood.

**51. Date of Next Meeting**

51.1 The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on 9 January 2020 at 10.30am at County Hall, Chichester.

The meeting ended at 1.21 pm

Chairman

**David Barling**

Chairman of the Children and Young People's  
Services Select Committee

Telephone: [07808366300](tel:07808366300)

e-mail: [david.barling@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:david.barling@westsussex.gov.uk)



---

18 December 2019

Nigel Jupp

**Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

Dear Nigel,

**Children and Young People's Services Select Committee - Woodlands Meed**

At the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee meeting on 4 December 2019 members considered the above item. The report laid out 4 possible options for the site, with a proposal that an independent specialist survey be commissioned to provide a baseline against which these options could be considered.

The Committee made a series of recommendations for your consideration, as listed below:

- That there is a firm decision made by the end of January 2020.
- The Committee feels that only options 1 and 2 should be considered, with a preference for option 2 (136 pupil place new build). Option 4 should not be considered.
- Members felt there was no need for a further independent specialist survey to be undertaken.
- For you to use your best endeavours to bridge any funding gap if option 1, or option 2 is agreed upon.
- That you ensure any problem of access to the site for construction work is overcome.

I trust that you will take the Committee's comments into consideration. A progress update on Woodlands Meed will return to the Committee in March 2020. I would be very grateful if you could provide any written response you wish to make to this letter by 27 December 2019 to [rachel.allan@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.allan@westsussex.gov.uk), in time for the Committee's next meeting on 9 January 2020.

With best regards,

David Barling

Chairman, Children and Young Peoples Services Select Committee

This page is intentionally left blank



## Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The County Council must give at least 28 days' notice of all key decisions to be taken by members or officers. The Plan describes these proposals and the month in which the decisions are to be taken over a four-month period. Decisions are categorised according to the [West Sussex Plan](#) priorities of:

- **Best Start in Life** (those concerning children, young people and schools)
- **A Prosperous Place** (the local economy, infrastructure, highways and transport)
- **A Safe, Strong and Sustainable Place** (Fire & Rescue, Environmental and Community services)
- **Independence in Later Life** (services for older people or work with health partners)
- **A Council that Works for the Community** (finances, assets and internal Council services)

The most important decisions will be taken by the Cabinet sitting in public. The [schedule of monthly Cabinet meetings](#) is available on the website. The Forward Plan is updated regularly and key decisions can be taken on any day in the month if they are not taken at Cabinet meetings. The [Plan](#) is available on the County Council's website and from Democratic Services, County Hall, West Street, Chichester, PO19 1RQ, all Help Points and the main libraries in Bognor Regis, Crawley, Haywards Heath, Horsham and Worthing. [Published decisions](#) are also available via the website.

A key decision is one which:

- Involves expenditure or savings of £500,000 or more (except treasury management); and/or
- Will have a significant effect on communities in two or more electoral divisions in terms of how services are provided.

The following information is provided for each entry in the Forward Plan:

<b>Decision</b>	A summary of the proposal.
<b>Decision By</b>	Who will take the decision - if the Cabinet, it will be taken at a Cabinet meeting in public.
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Which of the five priorities in the West Sussex Plan the proposal affects.
<b>Date added</b>	The date the proposed decision was added to the Forward Plan.
<b>Month</b>	The decision will be taken on any working day in the month stated. If a Cabinet decision, it will be taken at the Cabinet meeting scheduled in that month.
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	How views and representations about the proposal will be considered or the proposal scrutinised, including dates of Select Committee meetings.
<b>Background Documents</b>	The documents containing more information about the proposal and how to obtain them (via links on the website version of the Forward Plan). Hard copies are available on request from the decision contact.
<b>Author</b>	The contact details of the decision report author
<b>Contact</b>	Who in Democratic Services you can contact about the entry

### Finance, assets, performance and risk management

Each month the Cabinet Member for Finance reviews the Council's budget position and may take adjustment decisions. A similar monthly review of Council property and assets is carried out and may lead to decisions about them. These are noted in the Forward Plan as 'rolling decisions'.

Each month the Cabinet will consider the Council's performance against its planned outcomes and in connection with a register of corporate risk. Areas of particular significance may be considered at the scheduled Cabinet meetings.


Significant proposals for the management of the Council's budget and spending plans will be dealt with at a scheduled Cabinet meeting and shown in the Plan as strategic budget options.

For questions contact Helena Cox on 033022 22533, email [helena.cox@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:helena.cox@westsussex.gov.uk).

**Published: 27 December 2019**

## Forward Plan Summary

### Summary of all forthcoming executive decisions in West Sussex Plan priority order

Page No	Decision Maker	Subject Matter	Date
 <b>Best Start in Life</b>			
	Director of Finance and Support Services	Award of Contract for the expansion of Manor Green Primary School, Crawley	December 2019
	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills	Replacement All Weather Pitch at The Weald Community School, Billingshurst	December 2019
	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills	Southwater Infant and Junior Schools - Additional Funding Replacement Accommodation	December 2019
	Cabinet	Small Schools Proposals	January 2020
	Cabinet	Woodlands Mead College Site, Burgess Hill - Allocation of Funding for Project Delivery	January 2020
	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills	School Funding 2020/21	January 2020
	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills	Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools in West Sussex and the Coordinated Scheme of Admissions	February 2020
	Cabinet	Adoption of the West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach	March 2020
	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills	Provision of new school hall at Thorney Island Primary School	April 2020
<b>Strategic Budget Options 2020/21</b>			
	Cabinet	Review of Fees and Charges	January 2020
	Cabinet	Reduction in the Post-16 Support Service	January 2020

## Best Start in Life

### Director of Finance and Support Services

<b>Award of Contract for the expansion of Manor Green Primary School, Crawley</b>	
<p>Following a review of current provision and anticipated future need, in early January 2019 the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills agreed a statutory notice to increase space at Manor Green Primary School in Crawley (Decision reference <a href="#">ES16</a> (18/19)). The school caters for a wide-range of Special Educational Needs, particularly for children with moderate and severe learning difficulties, complex social and communication difficulties or those who have been identified as having an Autistic Spectrum Condition. The increase in space would enable the school to increase planned places by 36 from 164 to 200.</p> <p>To accommodate the additional pupils two further classrooms will need to be built. The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills approved the allocation of funds required to enable this project to proceed and to delegate authority to the Director of Property and Assets to award the contract for the works - Decision ref: <a href="#">ES05 (19/20)</a></p> <p>The Director of Property and Assets will be asked to award the construction contract to expand Manor Green Primary School.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Andrew Edwards - Director of Finance and Support Services
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	30 July 2019
<b>Month</b>	December 2019
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>School</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Acting Chief Executive via the author or officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Carol Bruce Tel: 033 022 23055
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart - Tel: 033 022 22540

### Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

<b>Replacement All Weather Pitch at The Weald Community School, Billingshurst</b>
<p>The County Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient primary and secondary school places for all children who need a place. As part of the secondary school</p>

curriculum, Physical Education is a core subject, and suitable provision is required to ensure a wide range of sport can be offered to ensure children are given the Best Start In Life.

The Weald Community School, Billingshurst, has an All Weather Pitch facility which is in a deteriorating condition and is now at the end of its life. The pitch requires replacement to ensure continued provision for sport.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to approve the allocation of capital funding from Section 106 contributions to undertake a project to replace the All Weather Pitch at The Weald Community School thereby ensuring ongoing sports provision to meet the needs of the secondary school curriculum.

<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Jupp - Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	21 August 2019
<b>Month</b>	December 2019
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	School Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources  Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Leigh Hunnikin Tel: 033 022 23051
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart - Tel: 033 022 22540

### Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

<b>Southwater Infant and Junior Schools - Additional Funding Replacement Accommodation</b>	
<p>In June 2018 the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills gave authority to commence a procurement to replace the modular teaching accommodation at Southwater Infant and Junior Schools to ensure the schools can continue to accommodate the demand for pupil places in the locality (decision reference <a href="#">ES03 (18/19)</a>).</p> <p>Following full design which included submission and receipt of planning permission, detailed costings have now been sought which exceed the budget available.</p> <p>Following a detailed review of options, the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to approve an increase in budget, funded from received Section 106 contributions, to allow the project to progress.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Jupp - Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	7 August 2019
<b>Month</b>	December 2019
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources Representation can be made via the officer contact.
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Carol Bruce Tel: 033 022 23055
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Tel. 033 022 22540

### Cabinet

Small Schools Proposals	
<p>In September 2019 the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills took a <a href="#">decision</a> (decision reference ES02(19/20)) to approve the commencement of a consultation in relation to proposals for change at the at all, none or any of the following schools:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clapham and Patching CE Primary School, Clapham, Worthing</li> <li>• Compton and Up Marden CE School, Compton, Chichester</li> <li>• Rumboldswyke CE Infants' School, Chichester</li> <li>• Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst</li> <li>• Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid, Haywards Heath</li> </ul> <p>The <a href="#">consultation</a> is due to end in late November 2019. Following assessment of the outcome of the consultation, should specific proposals for any of the schools listed emerge, the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to agree to launch a consultation seeking views on these specific proposals.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Crow, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Lanzer, Mr Marshall, Mr Jupp, Mr Elkins, Mrs Russell, Mrs Urquhart - Cabinet
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	25 October 2019
<b>Month</b>	January 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>Schools Governing Bodies Diocese of Chichester Education Parents and carers Small Schools Task and Finish Group Children and Young People's Services Select Committee 9 January 2019</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made</p>

## Agenda Item 5

	to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Graham Olway Tel: 033 022 23029
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart Tel: 033 022 22540

### Cabinet

<b>Woodlands Meed College Site, Burgess Hill - Allocation of Funding for Project Delivery</b>	
<p>Woodlands Meed is a Special School and College for 2-19 year olds located in Burgess Hill. The existing accommodation at the College site has significant suitability and condition issues meaning the College is unable to offer the full curriculum and unable to accommodate the full range of Special Educational Needs.</p> <p>In order to address this, in February 2019 the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills took a decision (ES18 (18/19)) to approve the allocation of £0.5m from the Capital Programme to enable a costed design to be produced for rebuilding and expanding Woodlands Meed College on its current site. This has involved the appointment of a full design team through the County Council's Multi-Disciplinary Consultant to undertake the design work required to develop the feasibility design into a formal proposal enabling costs to be sought for all elements of the proposal.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to agree the allocation of funds from the Capital Programme to enable the rebuilding and expansion project at Woodlands Meed to proceed.</p> <p>.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mrs Urquhart, Mr Elkins, Mrs Russell, Mr Jupp, Mr Marshall, Mr Lanzer, Mr Hunt, Mrs Jupp, Mr Crow - Cabinet
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in LIfe
<b>Date added</b>	1 July 2019
<b>Month</b>	January 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>School Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	Cabinet Member Decision ES18(18/19)
<b>Author</b>	Leigh Hunnikin Tel: 033 022 23051

<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart - 033 022 22540
----------------	-------------------------------

### Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

<b>School Funding 2020/21</b>	
<p>In September 2017 the Government announced its plans to allocate funding to Local Authorities (LAs) for Schools and High Needs through a new National Funding Formula (NFF). It is the long term intention for mainstream schools to receive this funding directly from Government, but no date for this has yet been set. Until then the County Council is responsible for distributing funding to schools through its locally agreed formula. The County Council needs to review its local formula factors and unit values for the allocation of funding to mainstream schools to determine how best to make changes to move towards full NFF implementation.</p> <p>Finance regulations require that schools and academies are consulted about any proposals to change the local formula or other funding arrangements that may affect future school funding. Formal consultation with schools and academies about proposed changes for 2020/21 took place between 23<sup>rd</sup> October and 13<sup>th</sup> November 2019 and the outcome of this consultation is to be discussed by the Schools Forum at its meeting at the end of November.</p> <p>Along with proposals to change the local formula, the consultation also covered the potential transfer of funds from the Schools block to the High Needs block to address cost pressures in this budget.</p> <p>Following analysis of the responses from schools to the consultation proposals and the outcome of the consultation with the Schools Forum the Cabinet Member will be asked to consider whether to approve the changes to the distribution of funding for 2020/21.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Jupp - Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	2 December 2019
<b>Month</b>	January 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>All West Sussex Maintained Schools and Academies Children and Young People's Services Select Committee 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 Schools Forum : 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	Schools Revenue Funding 2020 to 2021 Operational Guide
<b>Author</b>	Andy Thorne Tel: 03302223349

<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart Tel: 033022 22540
----------------	---------------------------------

### Cabinet Member for Education and Skills

<b>Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools in West Sussex and the Coordinated Scheme of Admissions</b>	
<p>The County Council has a statutory duty to set the school admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in West Sussex and to publish a national scheme of coordination for all schools. The scheme of coordination allows parents to complete one application form to the authority in which they reside, this is to ensure that each child receives one offer of a school place. It is proposed that the coordinated scheme for the normal admission round remains the same for 2021</p> <p>With regard to admission arrangements the proposal is to make changes to the oversubscription criteria in two areas, to include a higher priority for children of staff who have been in post for more than two years in the school to which they are applying; and to include children who are subject of a Special Guardianship Order (SGO) to be considered as the same as Children Looked After in order of priority.</p> <p>There are also proposals for consultation to move the catchment area for the Kilnwood Vale Development in North Horsham from the catchment area of Waterfield Primary School and Ifield Community College to a new Kilnwood Vale catchment for primary aged children and Millais and Forest catchment area for secondary age children.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be asked to endorse the proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in West Sussex for the academic year commencing September 2021 and approve the coordinated scheme of admissions.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Jupp - Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	2 December 2019
<b>Month</b>	February 2020
<b>Consultation/Representations</b>	<p>In accordance with admission regulations, consultation is taking place between December 2019 and end of January 2020 for a period in excess of the minimum 6 week requirement. The key stakeholders consulted include the Resources, School Organisation, Capital and Admissions (Resources and SOCA) sub-group of the Schools Forum, parents, school staff and governors, Diocesan Authorities and neighbouring local authorities. A consultation document is available on the West Sussex website and promoted through the local press.</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, via the Author or officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None

<b>Author</b>	Ellie Evans Tel: 033022023582
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart Tel: 033022 22540

**Cabinet**

<b>Adoption of the West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach</b>	
<p>In collaboration with partners across West Sussex the County Council is developing a West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach. This will set out the direction and commitment for how partners in West Sussex will deliver a shared vision for children and young people placing children at the heart of all we do.</p> <p>It will be a single over-arching strategic approach based on the West Sussex Plan, the Health and well-Being Strategy and Children's Services Practice Improvement Plan for Social Care as well as other key strategies where outcomes for children, young people and their families will be improved. It will set out how West Sussex will be a great place for children and young people, where all, including those who are vulnerable or disadvantaged, have the best possible start in life and are supported by the whole community to succeed.</p> <p>Cabinet will be asked to approve the adoption of the West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Marshall, Mr Jupp, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Elkins, Mrs Russell, Mrs Jupp, Mr Hunt, Mr Lanzer, Mr Crow - Cabinet
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	27 August 2019
<b>Month</b>	March 2020
<b>Consultation/Representations</b>	<p>Internal (County Council) and external partners including Health and Well-being Board; Local Safeguarding Partnership; Community Safety; Schools (primary and secondary) Health; Police; Children and Young People; District and Borough Councils.</p> <p>Children and Young People's Services Select Committee – 4 March 2019</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Ann Marie Dodds Tel: 033 022 29331
<b>Contact</b>	Wendy Saunders - Tel: 033 022 22553

**Cabinet Member for Education and Skills**

<b>Provision of new school hall at Thorney Island Primary School</b>	
<p>The County Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for all children who need a place. Over recent years there has been an increase in pupil numbers at Thorney Island Primary School and an enlarged school hall is now required to provide sufficient and suitable accommodation for the additional children.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to approve the allocation of capital funding from the Basic Need Capital Programme to enable the project to proceed.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Jupp - Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	21 August 2019
<b>Month</b>	April 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>School Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken</p>
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Leigh Hunnikin Tel: 033 022 23051
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart - Tel: 033 022 22540

## Strategic Budget Options 2020/21

**Cabinet**

<b>Review of Fees and Charges</b>	
<p>The County Council reviews its fees and charges at least annually to ensure statutory fees meet current guidelines and discretionary fees reflect market conditions and achieve the required service outcomes. Any changes to fees and charges are proposed to be implemented from 01 January 2020 where possible. The Cabinet Member will be asked to endorse the report. Parking charges will be considered separately by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mr Hunt - Cabinet
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	A Council that Works for the Community

<b>Date added</b>	12 September 2019
<b>Month</b>	January 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	Cabinet Members Representation can be made via the officer contact.
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Katharine Eberhart Tel: 033 022 22682
<b>Contact</b>	Suzannah Hill Tel. 033 022 22551

### Cabinet

<b>Reduction in the Post-16 Support Service</b>	
<p>The post-16 support service works with those young people not in employment, education or training (NEET). The service assists with carrying out the statutory requirement of tracking those individuals who are NEET and supports greater participation through the organisation of Careers/Apprenticeship Fairs across the county and arranges the Apprenticeship Graduation Ceremony.</p> <p>The funding of the service is currently supplemented by the European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) project which is a joint scheme with Brighton and Hove City Council. The programme finishes on 31 December 2020.</p> <p>NEET tracking is the statutory element of the work carried out by the post-16 support service, therefore, once the ESIF funding ceases it is proposed that, as well as ESIF fixed term contracts coming to an end, the County Council will reduce the level of service provided. Work is progressing on assessing the impact of options – from a reduction in the level of service to complete withdrawal of the service.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills will be asked to assess the outcome of this work and approve a proposal to either reduce or withdraw the post-16 support service.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Mrs Urquhart, Mrs Russell, Mr Elkins, Mr Jupp, Mr Marshall, Mr Crow, Mrs Jupp, Mr Hunt, Mr Lanzer - Cabinet
<b>West Sussex Plan priority</b>	Best Start in Life
<b>Date added</b>	30 July 2019
<b>Month</b>	January 2020
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>Staff and UNISON have been informed of the requirement to develop options for the post-16 support service. Staff are engaged in the development work on options and both staff and UNISON will be kept updated as the review progresses.</p> <p>Children and Young People's Services Select Committee – 23 October 2019</p>

## Agenda Item 5

	Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
<b>Background Documents</b> (via website)	Cabinet Papers
<b>Author</b>	Danny Pell Tel: 033 022 22144
<b>Contact</b>	Monique Smart - Tel - 033 022 22540

<b>Children and Young People's Services Select Committee</b>
--

<b>9 January 2020</b>
-----------------------

<b>Small Schools: Report from the Task and Finish Group</b>
---

<b>Report by Chairman of the Small Schools Task and Finish Group</b>
--

### **Summary**

The Children and Young People's Services Select Committee agreed at its meeting on 11 September 2019, that a Small Schools TFG should be set up, in order to assist the scrutiny of potential proposals for changes to five small schools in West Sussex. The TFG met three times between September and December 2019 to inform the Committee's scrutiny of any proposals which may arise for the Cabinet to determine.

### **The focus for scrutiny**

The Children and Young People's Services Select Committee are asked to consider and discuss the recommendations of the TFG set out in 2.1 in relation to action to address the current process and 2.2 in relation to any future process and prepare a response from the Committee to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, prior to any decision by the Cabinet on 14 January 2020.

The Chairman will summarise the output of the debate for consideration by the Committee in order to formalise its response to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills.

## **Proposal**

### **1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 At its meeting on 11 September 2019 the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee (CYPSSC) agreed to establish the Small Schools Scrutiny Task and Finish Group.
- 1.2 The Task and Finish Group met three times; on 18 September 2019, 24 October 2019 and 4 December 2019 with the following purpose:
  - To maintain contact with the Cabinet Member and the Director of Education and Skills in relation to the work on any future proposals.
  - To consider and review the approach of the County Council to the selection of schools and identified options for future proposals in relation to potential changes of arrangements for small schools.
  - To receive and consider representations from relevant stakeholders

- To obtain and consider such additional evidence and advice as it may determine.
- To make such recommendations as it considers appropriate arising from its deliberations.

1.3 The TFG heard from a range of witnesses in person and written representations in order to help its deliberations. These included representatives from all five schools affected, executive heads, The Schools Forum, the West Sussex Governors Association and the Diocese of Chichester.

## **2. Output**

2.1 The Task and Finish Group considered the evidence provided to them. The recommendations made during the process of the TFG are set out below together with relevant responses.

- The consultation process should include a 'do nothing' option as a possible recommendation from the process. This was agreed and implemented as part of the consultation.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills should reflect upon and consider all representations received before any decision is taken and review all options carefully so that TFG are assured that the Cabinet Member is fully informed.
- Provide the TFG with a breakdown of data by respondent type. This was presented at the final meeting on 4 December 2019.
- Officers, as a matter of urgency, were to check all data on the consultation website to ensure accuracy and make sure the source and date of the data is supplied. This was completed.
- The consultation be altered to make it clear that respondents can provide comments outside the specific questions. The consultation portal was updated to reflect this.

2.2 The following recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills were agreed at the final meeting of the TFG on 4 December 2019 to go forward to a meeting of Children and Young People's Services Select Committee on 9 January 2020, for consideration alongside the proposals for consideration by the Cabinet:

- That there is improved communication between the County Council and named schools in future consultations, including early conversations.
- That training on school viability should be provided to school governors, as well as risk management in relation to viability in order to ensure that governors have a good level of support.
- That any potential future consultations concerning schools include a clear context as part of the consultation papers.

- That the quality of data provided as part of any consultation process is thoroughly checked with any schools concerned to ensure accuracy, and that any data produced is received and understood by the school.
- That the timeline for any future consultation is carefully considered alongside school holidays and other timelines, such as admissions, that affect schools.
- That future consultations are considered in a more strategic and geographical area context.
- That County Councillors are encouraged to have regular contact with the schools within their division.

### **3. Resources**

- 3.1 It is not anticipated that the recommendations contained within this report would incur any additional direct costs or resource implications.

### **Factors taken into account**

#### **4. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee**

- 4.1 The Children and Young People's Services Select Committee are asked to consider and discuss the recommendations of the TFG (set out in 2.2) and agree a response from the Committee to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, prior to decision by Cabinet on 14 January 2020.

#### **5. Consultation**

- 5.1 The TFG consulted a number of witnesses, as outlined in 1.3.

#### **6. Risk Implications and Mitigations**

- 6.1 Risks will be considered as part of the wider discussion on any draft proposals for decision by the Cabinet.

#### **7. Other Options Considered**

- 7.1 Information on other options will be included in the draft proposals for decision by the Cabinet.

#### **8. Equality Duty**

- 8.1 Further detail on the impact of the equality duty will be detailed in the draft proposals for decision by the Cabinet.

#### **9. Social Value**

- 9.1 N/A

#### **10. Crime and Disorder Implications**

- 10.1 N/A

#### **11. Human Rights Implications**

- 11.1 N/A

**Hilary Flynn, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group**

**Contact:** Rachel Allan, Senior Advisor, Democratic Services 0330 222 8966

**Appendices:** None

**Background Papers :** [18 September 2019 Notes](#)  
[24 October 2019 Notes](#)  
[4 December 2019 Notes](#)

---

## **Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee**

**9 January 2020**

### **Consultation on proposed reorganisation of rural and small schools in West Sussex**

#### **Report by Director of Law and Assurance**

---

#### **Summary**

The consultation on the proposed reorganisation of rural and small schools in West Sussex commenced on 7 October 2019 and closed on 25 November 2019. The attached draft decision report (Appendix A) outlines the findings from the consultation. The report goes on to provide details for the future operation of each school. The proposals for each school have been developed in light of the consultation responses and feedback received from the consultation public meeting events.

Following this meeting, any comments and recommendations will be presented to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills for his consideration ahead of the decision being taken collectively at Cabinet on 14 January 2020.

#### **Focus for scrutiny**

The Committee is asked to consider the attached draft Cabinet Member decision report and provide comment to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills prior to the formal decision being taken.

The Chairman will summarise the output of the debate for consideration by the Committee.

---

#### **Details**

The background and context to this item for scrutiny are set out in the attached reports (listed below), including resource and risk implications, Equality, Human Rights, Social Value, Sustainability and Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessments.

#### **Issues for consideration by the Select Committee**

- 1.1 The Committee is asked consider the attached draft Cabinet Member decision report, which has been informed by a period of engagement with stakeholders. Issues members may wish to explore include;
  - a) The outcome of the consultation process.

- b) The proposals, as set out in Paragraph 2.
- c) Other options considered as set out in Paragraph 7, for example the impact of not progressing with these proposals.

**Tony Kershaw**

Director of Law and Assurance

**Contact Officer:** Rachel Allan, 0330 222 8966

**Appendix A:** Draft Decision Report: Consultation on proposed reorganisation of rural and small schools in West Sussex

**Background papers**

None

Agenda Item 7

**Part I Decision Report Template Revised June 2019**  
**(for decisions by Cabinet Members and Officer Key Decisions)**

<b>Cabinet Decision</b>	<b>Ref No:</b>
<b>January 2020</b>	<b>Key Decision:</b> <b>Yes</b>
<b>Consultation on proposed reorganisation of rural and small schools in West Sussex</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Director for Education and Skills</b>	<b>Electoral Division(s):</b>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The consultation on the proposed reorganisation of rural and small schools in West Sussex commenced on 7 October 2019 and closed on 25 November 2019. This report outlines the findings from the consultation. The report goes on to provide recommendations for the future operation of each school. The proposals for each school have been developed in light of the consultation responses and feedback received from the consultation public meeting events. The CYPSS Scrutiny Committee will review the proposals on 09/01/2020. The Cabinet will then be asked to approve the recommendations detailed below.</p> <p>Full details of the consultation responses and analysis can be found in the appendices .</p>	
<p><b>West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context</b></p> <p><b>Best Start in Life:</b> Approval of the small school organisation proposals supports the County Council's aspirations to be placed in the top quarter of performing Councils within three years, in terms of children's attainment. Great strides are being made towards this by working in partnership with schools and parents and these consultations are integral to helping achieve high performing and financially sustainable schools in West Sussex that benefit the children and communities for years to come.</p>	
<p><b>Financial Impact</b></p> <p>A project team has been set up and funded within the Education and Skills budget. The potential financial impact of implementing the preferred options for each of the five schools is set out in section 4.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>The Cabinet is asked to support the proposals outlined in section 2 going forward to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consult on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Closure of Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School by September 2020.</li> <li>➤ Closure of Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School effective September 2020</li> <li>➤ Relocation of Warninglid Primary School and the federation of the</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

- school by September 2021 (subject to developers progress) .
  - Closure of Stedham Primary School by September 2020<sup>1</sup> whilst continuing to discuss federation proposals
2. Progress the Federation proposals for:
- Compton and Up Marden C of E Primary School.

## Proposal

### 1. Background and Context

- 1.1 In October 2018 the [School Effectiveness Strategy 2018 - 2022](#) was adopted by the County Council following public consultation. It sets out the objectives for school organisation and the criteria against which schools should be assessed in order to meet these objectives. Implementation of the strategy will help ensure that in West Sussex:

*"Primary schools will be of a sufficient size to be viable in the future, offer a high quality and broad curriculum, attract pupils from the local community and provide strong outcomes for children".*

The school effectiveness strategy also states that:

*"where schools are identified as being at risk, they need to consider options for change. In addition to "no change" These could include:*

- Consulting on amalgamating or merging two or more schools to become an all-through primary school.
- Consulting on expanding the age range of a group of schools so each becomes all-through primary schools.
- Consulting on federating two or more schools.
- Finally, consulting on closing a school."

- 1.2 Analysis by the County Council identified a number of schools which, when measured against the criteria set out in the School Effectiveness Strategy, were considered at risk. The criteria are set out below:

---

<sup>1</sup> Dependent on the school not providing a suitable pathway and implementation plan towards federation

- 1. Does the school have an infant to junior relationship with another school?
- 2. Is there a vacancy for a head teacher?
- 3. Is the curriculum better delivered by working with other nearby schools?
- 4. Does the budget prohibit leadership responsibilities from being distributed amongst a range of staff?
- 5. Does the school have difficulties recruiting high quality teachers, leaders or governors?
- 6. Can all the schools in an area sustain the projected numbers of local pupils over the next 5 years?
- 7. Are maximum pupil numbers for the school equal to or less than 100?
- 8. Does the school have less than or equal to 75% of pupils on roll in proportion to its capacity?
- 9. Do parental preferences for the school, taking into account the planned housing development, support the school reaching or exceeding 95% of the schools actual net capacity over the next 5 years?
- 10. Is the Ofsted inspection overall judgement of the school good or better (or recent LA monitoring indicates the school is not moving quickly to good)?
- 11. Does the financial projection for the next 3 years show a sustainable budget?
- 12. Does the school offer a specialism that is not replicated elsewhere in the area?

- 1.3 As part of the process of implementing the School Effectiveness Strategy, the County Council held workshops on 9 October 2018, 27 February 2019 and 5 March 2019, to which a number of schools were invited to attend and discuss data on their schools. Attendees took away the 12 Key Questions to consider. Governing bodies were specifically encouraged to consider whether federations, where one governing body operates across two or more schools, would be beneficial to their school. The outcome of the analysis and discussions were reviewed, with further discussions being initiated with a number of schools on future options such as merger, federation, relocation or closure. A number of schools have subsequently progressed discussions and some have made steps towards federation, most notably the federation of Amberley Primary School with St James's C of E Primary School Coldwaltham, and the developing partnership between Rake Primary School and Rogate C of E Primary School who have been working towards federation for some 12 months.
- 1.4 Due to specific circumstances around five of these schools, an impact assessment was conducted between April and June 2019. The specific circumstances for four of the schools are set out in the previously submitted [Impact Assessments](#). Rumboldswyke CE Infant school is not a rural school but serves the community of Chichester. The school was included due to its vulnerability, declining enrolment, and the quality of provision. Following the Ofsted inspection on 01 May 2019, the school was rated as inadequate. The options for the future of the school are therefore very limited following this judgement. Under the establishment and discontinuance of schools regulations 2013 the school has to either academise or close. Since the Ofsted inspection, discussions have taken place with the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) and the CE Diocese. The size and nature of the school makes finding a suitable Trust to academise the school extremely challenging. The RSC has agreed to await the outcome of consultation on the viability of the school before making the decision to issue an academy order. Unsuccessful approaches have been made to the four local Multi Academy Trusts (MAT's). Due to low enrolment, the financial outlook for this school is challenging.
- 1.5 Following the Children's and Young Peoples Select Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2019 the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills gave approval on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2019 for a consultation to take place on options for each

of the schools. A Task and Finish Group was also established to review the consultation process. The first meeting was held on 18<sup>th</sup> September (with two subsequent meetings held on 24<sup>th</sup> October and 4<sup>th</sup> December 2019).

- 1.6 During the period 7 October 2019 – 25 November 2019 a public consultation on options was held for each of the five schools. This consultation also included an online survey for members of the community and interested parties to 'have their say', opportunities for schools to submit their future plans and representations, contact with local parish councils, discussions with the Diocese and also a public meeting at each school. The Task and Finish Group heard representations from stakeholders and from each school.

## 2. Proposal Details

- 2.1 The updated consultation and decision making timetable (from the September 2019 decision paper) is set out below:

<b>7<sup>th</sup> October 25<sup>th</sup> November 2019</b>	<b>Stage one</b> – consultation on options
<b>January 2020</b>	The Cabinet will consider the results of the consultation and decide whether to publish specific proposals for any of the schools listed.
Should the Cabinet decide to proceed with publishing specific proposals on any of the schools the following timetable would then apply	
<b>February 2020</b>	<b>Stage two</b> – publication of proposals and 6 week representation period ( <b>planned to commence on 03<sup>rd</sup> February 2020</b> )
<b>April 2020</b>	<b>Stage three</b> – Cabinet decision on specific proposals for each of the schools.
<b>May/ June 2020</b>	<b>Stage four</b> – publication of statutory proposals (4 week representation period) followed by cabinet decision.
<b>31 August 2020</b>	<b>Stage five</b> – implementation of proposals (for Warninglid this will depend on delivery of the build on the Pease Pottage site, which is currently planned for June 2021)

- 2.2 After consideration of the outcome of the consultation process (**Stage 1**) alongside the previously issued impact assessment work, it is proposed that the County Council approves the following next steps:

- Consult on the closure of Clapham and Patching CE Primary School, Clapham, Worthing (**Stage 2**)
- Agree that the County Council officers work with Governors to progress proposals for the federation of Compton and Up Marden CE Primary School, Compton with an appropriate partner.
- Consult on the closure of Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School , Chichester (**Stage 2**)
- Consult on the closure of Stedham Primary School (**Stage 2**), unless the governors have submitted and agreed practical proposals and a realistic implementation plan for the federation of Stedham Primary School, Stedham, and that these proposals and plans are agreed with the Director of Education.
- Consult on the relocation of Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid, Haywards Heath to a new site in Pease Pottage Crawley, by September 2021 (subject to developers completing in June 2021). Prior to this relocation taking place, agree that County Council officers will work with Governors to progress the federation of Warninglid C of E Primary School with Colgate Primary School, to implement proposals that have been submitted by both schools.
- Agree that County Council officers prepare a summary report on the outcome of the further consultations and federation outlined in 2.2 to present to the Cabinet (**Stage 3**). The Cabinet Member will then decide whether to move to the next stage of issuing closure notices (**Stage 4**) for:
  - Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School, Clapham, Worthing by September 2020
  - Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School
  - Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst by September 2020<sup>2</sup>

and

  - Relocation of Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid to Pease Pottage (which will be in place prior to the relocation of Warninglid ready for intake in September 2021 subject to the developer).

## Factors taken into account

### 3. Consultation

- 3.1 On the 7 October 2019, copies of the public consultation document were distributed to the following:- Members of Parliament, County Local Committee (CLC) members, District and Parish councillors, union representatives, neighbouring authorities, the parents/carers, staff and

---

<sup>2</sup> Dependent on the school's response to submission of plans for federation and an appropriate implementation plan.

governors , early years providers, local libraries, the Diocese of Chichester and the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton and Independent Schools. The consultation was also published on the Internet and the proposals received local press coverage. During the period 7 October 2019 – 25 November 2019, five public consultation meetings were held at the schools affected at which some 550 people attended. Notes from each public meeting were added to the consultation website. The meetings were as follows:

- Clapham & Patching C of E Primary School – Tuesday 8 October 2019
- Compton & Up Marden C of E School – Monday 11 November 2019
- Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School – Thursday 7 November 2019
- Stedham Primary School – Thursday 24 October 2019
- Warninglid Primary School – Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October 2019

3.2 The consultation sought comments on a range of options available for the following schools in relation to proposals for change on the basis of the impact assessments.

- Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School, Clapham, Worthing
- Compton and Up Marden C of E School, Compton, Chichester
- Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst
- Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid, Haywards Heath

The options under consideration were:

- no change,
- merger,
- federation,
- relocation or
- closure.

In the case of Rumboldswyke CE Infants School, Chichester, the following options were not available for consultation due to the school's inadequate Ofsted rating:

- no change,
- merger,
- federation
- relocation

3.2 Responses to the consultation were received via the online survey, the response form in the consultation booklet, by letter and by email. Two petitions were also received; one for Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School, and one for Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School.

3.3 The consultation period ended on the 25 November 2019. A total of 1045 responses were received (1069 answered the question as to what they considered the best option, with some respondents answering questions for more than one school). 986 people had completed a response to the consultation either on line or by returning the response form at the back of the consultation document. 59 emails and letters were received in relation to the consultation and have been acknowledged. Of the 986 online consultation responses, 122 responses were received in relation to Clapham and Patching CE Primary School, 425 were received in relation to Compton & Up Marden CE School 162 were received in relation to Rumboldswyke CE infant School,

272 were received in relation to Stedham Primary School and 124 were received in relation to Warninglid Primary school. Some respondents commented on more than one school, while not all respondents answered all questions. A summary and detailed analysis of the online responses received is included in the appendices. There were also 10 responses received after the closing date, these comments have not been included in the final analysis.

Two petitions were received from Clapham and Patching (623 verified signatories from 1024 submitted) and Rumboldswyke (1151 verified signatories from 1443 submitted).

- 3.4 On the 9<sup>th</sup> January 2020 Children's and Young Peoples Services Scrutiny Committee will review the correspondence received throughout the consultation, the report of the Task and Finish Group (TFG) and the analysis of the responses before making their recommendation to the Cabinet.

#### **4. Financial (revenue and capital) and Resource Implications**

##### Revenue

- 4.1 Since funding for the day-to-day operations of schools comes from the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), the implications of any changes to school organisation for the Council's on-going revenue budget is fairly cost neutral. The amount of funding that a school receives to meet its day-to-day running costs is largely driven by the number of pupils on roll in the autumn census each year. As a result of any closure of a school, there will be a redistribution of funding across the remaining schools in that phase and the level of additional funding will vary at each of these schools depending on the number of extra pupils on roll that it attracts. Further work will be undertaken with schools in order to support them with their budget planning.
- 4.2 On assessment of the outcome of the pre-consultation, should the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills choose to consult on the specific proposals for each school, as recommended in this report, then despite the schools being funded by DSG, it has been estimated that the following potential revenue costs may fall to the County Council:
- One-off costs in relation to redundancy, payments in lieu of notice (pilon) and early retirement (£0.478m), and
  - On-going home to school transport costs (£0.107m) for those pupils who would live more than three miles away from the nearest alternative school.
- 4.3 In addition, where a school closes in August, it may be left with stranded contract costs (£0.100m) in relation to buildings maintenance, cleaning, transport, IT and other consumables for the remainder of the year.
- 4.4 A breakdown of these potential costs by school is set out in the table below:

	One-off Costs £m	Transport Costs £m	Stranded Costs £m
Clapham & Patching	£0.175	£0.029	£0.028
Rumboldswyke	£0.178	Nil	£0.028

Stedham	£0.125	£0.078	£0.044
<b>Total</b>	<b>£0.478</b>	<b>£0.107</b>	<b>£0.100</b>

- 4.5 Any one-off redundancy and pension costs and stranded contract costs may be able to be off-set through the use of any surplus balances remaining in any of the schools when they close. Any of the one-off costs that cannot be off-set in this way will be charged against the Education and Skill's dismissal or premature retirement budget next year. The value of this budget currently totals £0.490m. Of the three schools where closure could potentially be consulted on, one was in deficit at the end of 2018/19, and the remaining two had a combined surplus of £0.089m.
- 4.6 A project team has also been created in order to facilitate the pre-publication consultation and to assess both the views on, and the impact of, the various options for change at the 5 schools in question. The cost of this team is being met from within the existing Education and Skills revenue budget, and includes 12 months funding for backfilling posts within Schools Place Planning, Admissions, Human Resources and Finance.

#### Capital

- 4.7 Two potential capital costs have been identified:
- £0.020m to refurbish classrooms in existing schools to accommodate displaced pupils from Stedham Primary school, should the decision be taken to close this school, and
  - £0.075m to fund furniture fittings and equipment (FFE) at the new school in Pease Pottage in 2021 as part of relocation of Warninglid Primary School.

#### The effect of the proposal

- 4.8 Implementation of the proposed changes will support the "organisation objectives" as set out in the school effectiveness strategy namely:

*"Primary schools will be of a sufficient size to be viable in the future, offer a high quality and broad curriculum, attract pupils from the local community and provide strong outcomes for children".*

- 4.9 Parent carers and pupils who will be impacted by the closure or relocation of a school would need to find an alternative school. For those children with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), the Special Educational Needs Assessment Team (SENAT) will manage the transition and work with parents to submit a preference. SENAT would then consult the governors and leaders of the appropriate chosen schools. Children with EHCPs are the highest priority for admission to another mainstream school, but are not entitled to transport unless they opt for their nearest mainstream school and it is over statutory walking distance. Governors must be given 15 working days to respond to the consultation and SENAT would need to amend the EHCP. There will be adequate time during the summer term to complete the transfer for the start of the new school year in September 2020.

- 4.10 The Admissions rounds are a statutory process for those starting school, moving to junior school and secondary admissions. However, in the scenario of a closure the local authority would operate a mini round of admissions for all those children who would need to relocate to a new school. This would apply to all the year groups affected in a school. There would be an opening date and a closing date of a period of two weeks to complete an In Year application form expressing up to three preferences. After the closing date the local authority would then allocate along with any other in year applications. This would be undertaken by applying each application against the schools admission criteria against each application in the event of more applications than the number of places available for each school in the year group. If we are unable to meet one of the preferences, then the parent carer will be allocated the next nearest alternative school with space. This process would start after the statutory proposals (**Stage 4**) and the final decision in May 2020 for school admission in September 2020. Parents not allocated a place at their preferred school will have a right of appeal to an independent admissions' appeal panel.
- 4.11 For those parent carers who have submitted applications for places in September 2020 at a school which is closing as part of the current admissions round, it is hoped 3 preferences will have been submitted and the local authority will aim to meet one of the other preferences. The Local Authority would however allow the parent/carers to submit another preference on a new paper application prior to the 14th February for consideration. Places are allocated on priority, based on the over subscription criteria and therefore no guarantees can be given, but our aim is always to meet one of the preferences listed by parents/carers.

## 5. Legal Implications

None for the purpose of this report.

## 6. Risk Implications and Mitigations

Risks of not approving the implementation of the consultation	Mitigation
There is a risk that the National Funding Formula (Schools Block DSG) implementation will result in an increased number of schools with financial difficulties and increased instability of pupil numbers (due to surplus capacity) which will have an impact on schools' financial viability and educational standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Continue to work closely with schools on the budgeting and forecasting to ensure they do not go into financial difficulty.</li> <li>&gt; School effectiveness team continue to work closely with school to ensure standards are maintained</li> </ul>
There is a risk that those schools that are earmarked for closure or relocation may suffer from a falling roll before they close, and thereby lose DSG pupil funding as a result.	Schools will be able to bid for additional DSG funds from the Schools in Financial Difficulty budget where 'an unusual or unexpected one-off situation has occurred'.
There is a risk that the School	>Continuation of Locality workshops to

Effectiveness Strategy commitments may not be achieved with respect to schools organisation:  1) All through primaries 2) Local solutions to achieve Small School viability (federation, merger, relocation, closure).	review options and initiate discussions >Training/ recruitment of HT's with Exec Head capability.
There is a risk of pupils with EHCPs and those with school identified SEND being unsettled by any move and the receiving school not having the resources to meet their needs	The process of supporting parents will ensure that any move to a new placement is managed effectively with receiving schools engaged fully and with all necessary information for appropriate resources to be in place to ensure a smooth transition.

## 7. Options Considered

- 7.11 The option of not progressing and consulting on the chosen option for each of the five schools, would mean that we are not progressing the school effectiveness strategy "organisation objective" that *"Primary schools will be of a sufficient size to be viable in the future, offer a high quality and broad curriculum, attract pupils from the local community and provide strong outcomes for children"*. Concerns would not be addressed and further uncertainty for these schools is predicted. Action therefore needs to be taken following the analysis and public consultation in 2019.
- 7.12 The County Council has been in discussions with stakeholders throughout the consultation process to ensure that opportunities as and when they are presented are investigated and progressed to ensure that we achieve our School Effectiveness Strategy objective that *"Primary schools will be of a sufficient size to be viable in the future, offer a high quality and broad curriculum, attract pupils from the local community, and provide strong outcomes for children"*.
- 7.13 Despite being actively pursued by the County Council, no MATs have come forward to date to take on the academisation of Rumboldswyke CE Infant School and therefore this is no longer an option. This means that, for **Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School**, there is no other option, but to close. A review of catchment areas in Chichester may also be required.

### 7.2 Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School

- 7.21 Whilst the chair of governors stated publicly that "no change is not an option" no proposals were presented for federating Clapham and Patching C of E Primary School. There has been no *"sufficient and compelling evidence"* submitted to demonstrate that the school is, or could be *"financially and educationally viable, **and** able to draw its intake from the local community, into the future"*. Although there have been some initial conversations with a local Trust regarding the possible academisation of the school, due diligence has not been completed and discussion of the Trust's plans for the school were unconvincing in improving provision and enrolment from the local

community. A second Trust had been approached but has declined to pursue the opportunity.

- 7.22 Feedback though the consultation process has been mixed in relation to the school and its future. At the public meeting, some parents spoke passionately about the nurturing ethos of the school and how they had moved their children to the school due to poor experiences in meeting their children's special educational needs in other schools. Written responses to the consultation process were more varied however in how effectively the school was able to meet the needs of pupils with special educational needs. Indeed, the school's ability or inability to meet the needs of pupils with SEND when there was such a high proportion within the school was an important factor in many responses.
- 7.23 In recommending a consultation on the closure of the school, we are mindful that the Council has advanced plans agreed as part of the new SEND and Inclusion Strategy 2019-24 to establish a new Specialist Support Centre at St Margaret's CE Primary School, Angmering. This will ensure that specialist support and provision will be enhanced locally in a nearby CE primary school to ensure a nurturing provision along with the specialist support required to meet pupils' learning and emotional needs. Analysis of school places also indicates that there are sufficient planned places in the communities within which current pupils live. The building will remain with the local Diocese. A review of catchment areas may also be required.

### **7.3 Compton and Up Marden C of E Primary School**

- 7.31 Proposals have been received from the Governors of Compton and Up Marden CE Primary School for the school to remain unchanged. Whilst these proposals have been developed with good intent, they do not, on their own contain "*sufficient and compelling evidence*" that the school will be "*financially and educationally viable **and** able to draw its intake from the local community into the future*".
- 7.32 Views captured through the consultation process made strong representation of the impact that closure of the school would have on the local community. The school is one of a few within the county that is in receipt of additional financial support for sparsity due to its geographical isolation. In analysing availability in local schools to accommodate pupils in the event of closure, significant capital investment would also be required to create the additional places required.
- 7.33 Whilst taking into account the full range of representations received from the school and community, in addition to consideration of the geographical isolation, size and access to the range of specialist expertise at the school, strengthening a partnership and federation with an appropriate school or schools would support increasing access to expertise to enhance provision and help overcome some of the isolation faced.

### **7.4 Stedham Primary School**

- 7.41 Proposals have been received from the Governors of Stedham Primary School for the school to remain unchanged. The proposals presented however did not, on their own, contain "*sufficient and compelling evidence*" that the school will be "*financially and educationally viable **and** able to draw its intake from the local community into the future*". Whilst situated in the village of Stedham and drawing from a rural community, the school's proximity to the nearby market town of Midhurst and to schools in Midhurst and Easebourne, ensures that the school is not geographically isolated. Governors recognise that stronger links to the Midhurst and Easebourne school communities could bring benefits to all. Governors have very recently been proactive in engaging with local schools to explore the benefits of federation and to consider potential partnerships. This could provide the school with access to a broader range of specialist expertise and, between the schools, diversity in provision that could benefit each community. As part of the consultation process (**stage 2**) it is therefore anticipated that the Governors will prepare and submit updated proposals and an implementation plan for consideration by the Director of Education. If the proposals do not however demonstrate that there is "*sufficient and compelling evidence*" that the school, as part of a federation, is "*financially and educationally viable and able to draw its intake from the local community into the future*", then the recommendation will remain to consult on the closure of Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst.
- 7.42 If the final decision is to close Stedham Primary, Easebourne C of E Primary School (along with Midhurst C of E Primary School) has the capacity to expand the number of planned places required to accommodate (along with Midhurst C of E Primary School) pupils that would be displaced from Stedham Primary School. A review of catchment areas may also be required.

## **7.5 Warninglid C of E Primary School, Warninglid**

- 7.51 Warninglid Primary School governors were open in their view that to continue as they are is not an option, and that they had been working closely with the local authority over two years to secure a federation to strengthen the longer-term future of the school. The school made a strong case that the current location of the school is unhelpful due to the lack of visibility and low numbers of children from within the current catchment area. A new school is being built by developers at Pease Pottage and will open in September 2021 (subject to the developer completing the build by June 2021).
- 7.52 Consultation responses indicated that relocation to a new site would be a positive move. However, this was seen by some to potentially impact on other local schools. During the consultation process, the governing bodies of two neighbouring schools indicated an interest in establishing a federation with Warninglid during the consultation process. Whilst it is proposed that Warninglid Primary School relocates to the new site at Pease Pottage upon completion of the new build, it is recommended that a federation would also bring greater strength and support to the school. Proposals have been received from the governing bodies of both Warninglid and Colgate Primary School, to seek a federation on equal terms as such a partnership would bring benefits to both schools. Any relocation of the school to the Pease Pottage site will require the local authority to look at catchment areas for the

schools in the area, and also to work with parents of those children who live towards the south of the current school location to ensure that options for more local provision can be offered if required.

## **7.6 Rumboldswyke CE Infant School**

- 7.61 Rumboldswyke CE Infant school was one of the five schools for which discussions were taking place about future sustainability prior to the Ofsted inspection in May 2019. However, the inspection's rating of the school as inadequate restricted the future options available for the school. The school has to either academise or close. Discussion has taken place with the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) and the Church of England Diocese. Both are accepting that academisation of a school of the size of Rumboldswyke would be a challenge. The RSC has held back on the academisation order pending the consultation to determine the future viability. However, the options for the school are still limited and do not include remaining within the local authority's control, either through a stand-alone school or a federation. The consultation process has received significant publicity and reference has been made to a previous school judged inadequate having been allowed to remain in the local authority's control. The local authority has pursued this with the RSC and also has pursued local MATs to look at the feasibility of academisation. Neither have met with a positive response and therefore the only realistic option left will be to seek to close the school.
- 7.62 Suggestion has been made around expanding the school to incorporate key stage 2 pupils as an all-through primary school. Based on place planning, there are already sufficient key stage 2 places in Chichester. A concern has been raised regarding the impact of closure on reducing key stage 1 church school places within the community. However, the local authority is working with the Church of England Diocese to mitigate this risk and to ensure sufficient church school places for key stage 1 pupils into the future. The financial outlook for this school remains challenging and school enrolment continues to fall.
- 7.63 During the consultation period, the school received its first monitoring visit from Ofsted since being judged as inadequate. The visit recognised positive work and judged appropriate actions were taking place, and that the action and support plans were fit for purpose. Whilst recognising progress being made, reference is made to 'early signs' of progress in learning and achievement/progress. The HMI did not use the opportunity of the monitoring visit to reinspect the school for a full section 5 inspection. The DfE Schools Causing Concern protocol (September 2019) indicates that even where a second Ofsted Section 5 inspection judges the school to be no longer inadequate, this on its own would be insufficient to broaden the range of future options for the school.
- 7.64 Representations have been made that the school should remain open as future housing is planned nearby (Southern Gateway). However the development is long term and there are other schools with capacity, which are closer. Section 106 contributions will also fund additional capacity as part of the development.

- 7.65 The school land and site is mainly owned by the Church of England Diocese in the main and, following the completion of closure, the local authority will wish to engage with the Diocese to look at potential alternative uses of the building for educational purposes in preference to the site being sold for development.

## 8. Equality and Human Rights Assessment

The equality impact analysis will be updated continuously throughout the consultation process through the collection and analysis of data that arises as part of the consultation process. This information will then be used to inform the next stage (**Stage 3**) of the decision making process.

## 9. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment

The DFE guidance states that "there is a presumption against the closure of rural schools. This does not mean that a rural school will never close, but the case for closure should be strong and a proposal must be clearly in the best interests of educational provision in the area". Rumboldswyke CE Infant school is not a rural school and therefore this presumption does not apply in this case.

The effect of closure of schools on the communities of Clapham and Patching, Rumboldswyke and Stedham (if closure is the chosen option) and Warninglid (if relocation is the chosen option) was noted in several written responses during the consultation. An extract of relevant comments is set out below:

### Clapham & Patching

Clapham & Patching Village Hall Committee	The school is an essential part of the Clapham and Patching communities and its loss would significantly impact on those communities and the Village Hall.
Local Resident	This small village school is an integral part of our community. The children attend village events such as singing to the elderly at Christmas. They use the local woods as part of their Forest School education. They use the local churches for special services.
Local Resident	Clapham and Patching school is at the heart of our village community. Closure would have an impact on the village for generations to come. New houses are being built in the village and children will require a school.
Local Resident	This lovely little school is part of the heart of this village. We are working hard to keep our church and our shop/ cafe, and we certainly don't want to lose the school. These things together make the village more than a "dormitory village"; they make us a community.

### Rumboldswyke

Local Resident	The school should not be closed as it will have detrimental effects on the local area and children.
Parent/Carer	It is the last council owned Church of England school and it would be a huge loss to the city if the school was to close. Closure of the school would have a huge knock effect to the environment, the majority of parents walk or cycle their children to school. Closure of this school would mean a lot more cars on the road during an already hugely busy time for traffic in Chichester, which is not the message we should be teaching the next generation.
Local Resident	Chichester is a historic city and will only further lose its character and sense of community if we close the establishments that hold it together.
Local Resident	The closure of this school would be a short-sighted move, robbing the community of a valuable educational asset. It is a mistake that will be forever regretted

### **Stedham**

Local Resident	Stedham primary school has been part of village life for many years. It would be such sadness to see another school close.
Former Pupil	If you take away a village school, you take away the heart of the community. In a world where we are all rushing around and not always knowing our neighbours, with a village school you keep that community present that ensures everyone still knows everyone.
Teacher at Local School	Stedham is a good school, and as all schools are, is a hub of the community. The loss to those in the village and surrounding areas would be large, having a negative impact on the lives the children who currently attend the school and their families.
Former Pupil	I feel it would be a massive shame if the school was to close. I lived in Stedham until I was in my early twenties and my parents are still village residents. The school is the heart of the village and it helps to bring more families to the area, either to live in the village or families who love the school and choose to travel to Stedham in order to send their children there. These people then start to engage with village life by attending church, sports events or by supporting community events such as school fetes, bonfire night etc.
Teacher in Local Nursery	I feel very strongly that sustainability should not just be financial, but also environmental. Forcing Stedham families to drive their children to another school will increase traffic on the already congested roads around Midhurst and Easebourne. Air pollution would also increase. The use of the Woolbeding road as a

	<p>shortcut to Easebourne for these families is likely to lead to far more road traffic accidents. Both Midhurst and Easebourne schools already have significant problems with parents' vehicles at drop off and pick up times. Closing Stedham school would increase the risk of accidents or deaths outside these schools as well as further aggravating local residents. Childrens' health benefits from being able to walk to school. Closing Stedham would remove this option for all Stedham families and make a mockery of government 'walk to school' initiatives.</p>

### Warninglid

<p>Former Parent &amp; Former Chair of Governors</p>	<p>Built as it was halfway between Slaugham and Warninglid to serve pupils from both villages, it's obvious that the traditional catchment area does not at present yield enough pupils and that the nature of the intake generally has changed to accommodate more special needs requirements. But surely this is just a blip - with literally thousands of new houses being built in our area, demand for places will inevitably go up and there will be a danger that there won't be enough schools, so to close a little gem like Warninglid would seem very unwise, despite the many problems outlined in the documents.</p>
--	---

The potential impact of closure on transport (nearest school/subject to parental preference) and travel has been assessed as part of the [Impact Assessments](#). Further information on the community impact of these proposals will be undertaken during the planned consultation period.

## 10. Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment

None for the purpose of this report.

### Paul Wagstaff

Director of Education and Skills

**Contact Officer:** Graham Olway

Head of School Organisation, Capital Planning & Transport  
03302223029

### Appendices

**Appendix B:** Summary of Responses

**Appendix C:** Analysis by type of people

**Appendix D:** Key themes arising from the consultation

**Appendix E:** Available Places



This page is intentionally left blank

**Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children and young people?**

<b>Clapham &amp; Patching</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	62	51%
Agree	19	16%
Disagree	9	7%
Strongly disagree	12	10%
Don't know	20	16%

<b>Compton &amp; Up Marden</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	275	65%
Agree	99	23%
Disagree	17	4%
Strongly disagree	5	1%
Don't know	28	7%

<b>Rumboldswyke</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	81	50%
Agree	40	25%
Disagree	13	8%
Strongly disagree	6	4%
Don't know	22	14%

<b>Stedham</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	191	70%
Agree	56	21%
Disagree	5	2%
Strongly disagree	2	1%
Don't know	18	7%

<b>Warninglid</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	64	52%
Agree	18	15%
Disagree	10	8%
Strongly disagree	17	14%
Don't know	15	12%

**How much do you agree this school is centred on the needs of the children and learners?**

<b>Clapham &amp; Patching</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	74	61%
Agree	14	11%
Disagree	5	4%
Strongly disagree	8	7%
Don't know	21	17%

<b>Compton &amp; Up Marden</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	316	74%
Agree	77	18%
Disagree	4	1%
Strongly disagree	4	1%
Don't know	24	6%

<b>Rumboldswyke</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	109	67%
Agree	25	15%
Disagree	3	2%
Strongly disagree	3	2%
Don't know	22	14%

<b>Stedham</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	214	79%
Agree	35	13%
Disagree	3	1%
Strongly disagree	2	1%
Don't know	17	6%

<b>Warninglid</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	67	54%
Agree	13	11%
Disagree	14	11%
Strongly disagree	14	11%
Don't know	15	12%

**In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?**

<b>Clapham &amp; Patching</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	41	34%
Agree	24	20%
Disagree	8	7%
Strongly disagree	23	19%
Don't know	26	21%

<b>Compton &amp; Up Marden</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	274	64%
Agree	100	24%
Disagree	9	2%
Strongly disagree	5	1%
Don't know	37	9%

<b>Rumboldswyke</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	54	33%
Agree	50	31%
Disagree	6	4%
Strongly disagree	12	7%
Don't know	40	25%

<b>Stedham</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	140	51%
Agree	70	26%
Disagree	9	3%
Strongly disagree	6	2%
Don't know	47	17%

<b>Warninglid</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Strongly agree	25	20%
Agree	19	15%
Disagree	30	24%
Strongly disagree	25	20%
Don't know	25	20%

**What do you consider to be the best option for your school?**

<b>Clapham &amp; Patching</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Academisation	11	9%
Amalgamation	7	6%
Closure	17	14%
Federation	25	21%
Linked	3	2%
Relocation	3	2%
No Change	55	45%

<b>Compton &amp; Up Marden</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Academisation	8	2%
Amalgamation	7	2%
Closure	3	1%
Federation	28	7%
Linked	5	1%
Relocation	2	0%
No Change	370	87%

<b>Rumboldswyke</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Academisation	120	90%
Closure	14	10%

<b>Stedham</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Academisation	4	1%
Amalgamation	6	2%
Closure	6	2%
Federation	41	15%
Linked	6	2%
Relocation	0	0%
No Change	206	77%

<b>Warninglid</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>Respondents</b>
Academisation	2	2%
Amalgamation	2	2%
Closure	27	22%
Federation	11	9%
Linked	1	1%
Relocation	51	42%
No Change	28	23%

This page is intentionally left blank

Clapham & Patching C of E Primary School

Who	Total	1. Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children & young people?					Total	2. How much do you agree this is school centred on the needs of the children & learners?					Total	3. In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?					Total	4. What do you consider to be the best option for your school?						
	122	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	122	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	122	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	121	Academisation	Amalgamation	Closure	Federation	Linked	Relocation	No Change
A parent/carers	40	25	6	2	4	3	40	30	2	2	3	3	40	21	7	1	4	6	39	3		3	8	3		22
Staff member	10	7	2		1		10	8	1			1	10		6	1	2	1	10	2	1	1	3			3
Governor	5	3	1			1	5	4				1	5	1	1	1		2	5	2		2			1	
Local resident	42	17	6	6	5	8	42	19	7	3	3	10	42	13	6	4	12	7	42	3	3	10	7		3	16
Student/Pupil	1	1					1	1					1					1	1						1	
Other	24	9	4	1	2	8	24	12	4		2	6	24	6	4	1	5	9	24	1	3	3	5			12

Compton & Up Marden C of E School

Who	Total	1. Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children & young people?					Total	2. How much do you agree this is school centred on the needs of the children & learners?					Total	3. In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?					Total	4. What do you consider to be the best option for your school?						
	424	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	425	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	425	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	423	Academisation	Amalgamation	Closure	Federation	Linked	Relocation	No Change
A parent/carers	122	87	24	3	3	5	122	95	19	2	3	3	122	87	25	1	2	7	121	1	2	2	4	2		110
Staff member	9	6	1	1		1	9	6	1			2	9	6	2	1			9	1	1		1			6
Governor	5	3	1				5	4				1	5	4			1		5				1			4
Local resident	156	82	49	10	2	13	156	106	36	1	1	12	156	92	43	4	2	15	155	4	3	1	12	1		134
Student/Pupil	11	9	2				11	10	1				11	10			1		11							11
Other	121	88	22	3		8	122	95	20	1		6	122	75	30	3	1	13	122	2	1		10	2	2	105

Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School

Who	Total	1. Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children & young people?					Total	2. How much do you agree this is school centred on the needs of the children & learners?					Total	3. In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?					Total	4. What do you consider to be the best option for your school?							
	162	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	162	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	162	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	134	Academisation	Closure						
A parent/carers	62	37	16	1	4	4	62	49	7	1		3	62	19	22	2	3	16	50	47	3						
Staff member	7	3	2	1		1	7	5				2	7	1	4		2		7	6	1						
Governor	3		2	1			3			1	2		3	1		1	1		2	2							
Local resident	64	32	11	10	2	9	64	38	16	1	1	11	64	25	18	2	7	12	55	46	9						
Student/Pupil	1	1					1	1					1	1					1	1							
Other	25	8	9			8	25	16	2			6	25	7	6	1		11	19	18	1						

Stedham Primary School

Who	Total	1. Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children & young people?					Total	2. How much do you agree this is school centred on the needs of the children & learners?					Total	3. In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?					Total	4. What do you consider to be the best option for your school?						
	272	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	271	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	272	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	269	Academisation	Amalgamation	Closure	Federation	Linked	Relocation	No Change
A parent/carers	94	69	18	2	1	4	94	75	12	1	1	5	94	56	17	4	3	14	93	1	4	2	8	1		77
Staff member	17	12	4			1	17	14	1			2	17	9	4		2	2	17	1		1	3			12
Governor	3	2		1			3	2		1			3	1	1			1	3			2				1
Local resident	87	59	21	2	1	4	86	64	17	1	1	3	87	45	27	3	1	11	84	2	2	2	18	4		56
Student/Pupil	32	24	7			1	32	31	1				32	13	9			10	32				1			31
Other	39	28	4			7	39	28	4			7	39	16	12	2		9	40			1	9	1		29

Warninglid Primary School

Who	Total	1. Do you agree or disagree this school secures the highest quality educational provision for all children & young people?					Total	2. How much do you agree this is school centred on the needs of the children & learners?					Total	3. In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?					Total	4. What do you consider to be the best option for your school?						
	124	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	123	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	124	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	122	Academisation	Amalgamation	Closure	Federation	Linked	Relocation	No Change
A parent/carers	34	24	3	1	2	4	33	24	3		2	4	34	9	8	5	3	9	33	1		3	3		14	12
Staff member	17	10	2	2	1	2	16	10		4	1	1	17	2	3	8	3	1	16			3	2		10	1
Governor	7	3	2		1	1	7	4		1	1	1	7	1		3	2	1	6			2	1		3	
Local resident	27	12	7		6	2	27	13	6		6	2	26	8	6	4	7	1	27	1	1	6	3	1	8	7
Student/Pupil	2	1	1				2	1	1				2	1		1			2						1	1
Other	37	14	3	7	7	6	38	15	3	9	4	7	38	4	2	9	10	13	38		1	13	2		15	7

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Key themes arising from the consultation comments sections in the consultation**

### **Clapham & Patching C of E Primary School**

<b>KEY THEMES</b>	<b>Counts (number of mentions)</b>
Impact on the community	18
Impact on children with EHCP/SEND	24
Impact on the environment (for example – not being able to walk to school resulting in more traffic)	4
Impact on school places (for example – more housing being built resulting in a need for more school places & where would child go to school)	5
Preference of a 'small school' environment	13
Financial implications (for example – not financially viable)	4

### **Compton & Up Marden C of E Primary School**

<b>KEY THEMES</b>	<b>Counts (number of mentions)</b>
Impact on the community	122
Impact on children with EHCP/SEND	5
Impact on the environment (for example - not being able to walk to school resulting in more traffic)	6
Impact on school places (for example – more housing being built resulting in a need for more school places & where would child go to school)	13
Preference of a 'small school' environment	33
Financial implications (for example – not financially viable)	1

### **Rumboldswyke C of E Infant School**

<b>KEY THEMES</b>	<b>Counts (number of mentions)</b>
Impact on the community	22
Impact on children with EHCP/SEND	4
Impact on the environment (for example – not being able to walk to school resulting in more traffic)	15
Impact on school places (for example – more housing being built resulting in a need for more school places & where would child go to school)	24
Preference of a 'small school' environment	13
Financial implications (for example – not financially viable)	3

### Stedham Primary School

KEY THEMES	Counts (number of mentions)
Impact on the community	55
Impact on children with EHCP/SEND	3
Impact on the environment (for example – not being able to walk to school resulting in more traffic)	3
Impact on school places (for example – more housing being built resulting in a need for more school places & where would child go to school)	10
Preference of a 'small school' environment	32
Financial implications (for example – not financially viable)	

### Warninglid Primary School

KEY THEMES	Counts (number of mentions)
Impact on the community	9
Impact on children with EHCP/SEND	4
Impact on the environment (for example – not being able to walk to school resulting in more traffic)	
Impact on school places (for example – more housing being built resulting in a need for more school places & where would child go to school)	3
Preference of a 'small school' environment	16
Financial implications (for example – not financially viable)	12

## Interesting Quotes

*"Your planning and assessment is far too focused on money rather than focusing on the needs of the children" (Clapham).*  
*"It seems to mainly provide education for pupils outside its catchment area, pupils who should probably go to other schools" (Clapham).*  
*"Please look into the complaints records (that's it they have kept them as they should). You will see a pattern and that is why the school roll numbers are so low" (Clapham).*  
*"It's in the wrong place. Doesn't serve the locals" (Clapham).*

*"It is providing a perfectly good education to children of all strata and the fact that every child and teacher knows and interacts with everyone in the school is an incredibly rare and valuable provision. Leave it alone!" (Compton).*  
*"Quite simply-Compton is something special!" (Compton).*  
*"Don't fix what isn't broken" (Compton).*  
*"Absolute joke making families travel further then they have if you close it" (Compton).*  
*"Don't judge the future of this school by the short-term quality of its leadership" (Compton).*  
*"This should be a good school but it isn't (and hasn't been for a long time)" (Compton).*  
*"The school is full and failing. There are other local schools attended by the majority of the local children" (Compton).*  
*"You have jeopardised our intake for 2020 which I hope you will be accountable for" (Compton).*

*"Results are so bad that no-one is going to want it as an academy. Close it and put the children into The March, Kingsham or Lancastrian but use the money from the site to help those schools" (Rumboldswyke).*  
*"The school is small and poorly performing. It would be most cost effective for the children to move to other schools and they would receive a better education" (Rumboldswyke).*  
*"WSCC should hang their heads in shame - they systematically shut everything down - the soul of Chichester has long gone and now to propose shutting down this most fantastic school is incomprehensible" (Rumboldswyke).*  
*"I consider that there are other options that WSCC are refusing to fully and properly explore. They are simply looking for reasons to close this school to sell, and develop, the site" (Rumboldswyke).*  
*"This school appears to be in financial trouble, and does not have good outcomes for its pupils" (Rumboldswyke).*  
*"This consultation is a nonsense. It is poorly thought through and is divisive in nature" (Rumboldswyke).*

*"Most children in the area do not use this school and come from outside the catchment. This capacity is therefore not required and it would be better to maximise capacity in other schools closer to the homes of the children travelling to this school (reduce travelling and pollution)" (Stedham).*  
*"Rogate & Rake have recently linked & has seemed to really work for them. I think it would benefit to link Stedham to another local primary school rather than full closure" (Stedham).*  
*"If you take away a village school, you take away the heart of the community" (Stedham).*

*"The question 'In your opinion, would you agree or disagree this school is financially viable?' is a ridiculous question to ask on a public questionnaire. How is anyone going to analyse this question thoroughly without a financial background, statistics to compare it to and an aspirational level? I believe this has been added as a leading question to prompt people into believing it is financially unviable and should be removed if this is to be considered an impartial questionnaire" (Stedham).*

*"Leave our schools alone. Stop cutting. End austerity" (Stedham).*

*"There are not enough children from Stedham to keep this school open. Save the traffic problems and push the children back to Midhurst as they all come from there" (Stedham).*

*"There are other local schools the children can attend that would give better value for money" (Stedham).*

*"Work with us WSCC don't follow a strategic plan that is not open and honest!!! I have to ask, are you even reading this - or is it a done deal?" (Stedham).*

*"I'd love to see it remain as it is. I do understand however that it's probably not financially viable but sometimes it's more than just money" (Warninglid).*

*"The school hasn't sustained a suitable enrolment level and funds have and will carry on being restricted. The children would be better off being placed into another smaller school thus boosting the numbers and the funding of one school rather than have reduced funding for both schools" (Warninglid).*

*"How can a school that is so loved by so many be closed by the council just to open up another soulless school a few miles away? Just because of big business and the fact that this monster estate is obliged to build one" (Warninglid).*

*"I think that Warninglid Primary School should be relocated because the school provides good education but its present site is unsuitable" (Warninglid).*

*"I don't believe moving will be an issue to existing parents" (Warninglid).*

*"I don't understand why an old school is being closed just to open a new one. I know this consultation is a done deal and the decision has already been made to knock down Warninglid so this is no doubt a waste of my time. We will not be relocating our child to Pease Pottage" (Warninglid).*

*"It's just not financially viable from running costs, the teaching perspective, massive impact on children's academic achievement and I cannot see how they would increase their numbers" (Warninglid).*

School	Dec 19	Rec	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	PAN
<b>Chichester Central Spaces (as at 20th December 2019)</b>									
Central					39	48	25	46	90
Space					51	42	65	44	
Jessie Younghusband	30	30	31	31	31	31	30	29	30
Space								1	
Lancastrian infant	15	28	30						45
Space	30	2							
Parklands CP	57	60	60	61	60	61	60	60	60
Space	3								
Portfield Primary	30	29	30	31	29	24	30	30	30
Space		1			1	6			
Rumboldswyke	11	17	15						40
Space	29	23	25						
St Richards	46	45	45	45	45	47	42	45	
Space							2		
The March	30	30	31	30	27	29	30	30	30
Space					3	1			
Free school	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Space									
<b>TOTAL SPACE</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>48</b>		

<b>Rother Valley/ Chi National Park Spaces (as at 20th December 2019)</b>									
Singleton	8	7	11	11	7	5	14	10	
Space	2	3			3	5			
Bury CEP	10	13	3	5	13	4	8	10	
Space			7	5		6	2		
Compton & UpMarden	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Space	8	11	10	13	13	6	9		
Camelsdale Primary	30	30	30	29	32	30	32	30	
Space				1					
Duncton CEJ				14	10	17	13	20	
Space				6	10	3	7		
Easebourne CEP	30	25	50	31	31	32	30	30	
Space									
Fernhurst Primary	26	27	18	24	30	22	25	30	
Space	4	3	11	6		8	5		
Fittleworth CEV	20	18	19	20	15	18	14	20	
Space		2			5	2			
Grafham infant	21	16	20					20	
Space		4							
Harting CEP	20	18	25	13	15	16	10	20	
Space		2		7	5	4	10		
Hollycombe Primary	11	16	16	12	15	14	14	15	
Space	4			3		1	1		
Midhurst CEP	30	27	30	30	30	28	30	30	
Space		3				2			
Northchapel Primary	3	13	10	7	11	9	12	15	
Space	15	2	5	8	4	6	3		
Petworth CEP	30	29	21	27	25	43	34	30	
Space		1		3	5				
Rake CEP	16	15	19	13	14	17	14	15	
Space				2	1		1		
Rogate CEP	5	8	8	10	10	13	7	15	
Space	10	7	7	5	5	2	8		
St James CEP	12	10	8	8	7	7	13	15	
Space	3	5	7	7	8	8	2		
Stedham	10	5	15	11	22	3	14	15	
Space	5	10		4		12	1		
West Dean CEP	14	14	15	13	14	13	14	14	
Space				1		1			
<b>TOTAL SPACE</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>49</b>		

<b>Area around Clapham and Patching (as at 20th December 2019)</b>									
St John the Baptist CEP	22	16	24	22	19	20	14	<b>20</b>	
Space		4			1	0	6		
Ferring CEP	28	28	30	32	30	30	28	30	
Space	2	2					2		
ST Margarets CEP	51	58	48	62	72	59	72	<b>60</b>	
Space	9	2	12			1			
East Preston Infant and Junior	90	88	67	80	85	59	61	<b>90</b>	
Space		2	3	10	5	1	0		
ST Wilfrids	19	27	25	29	32	29	32	<b>30</b>	
Space	11	3	5	1		1			
Laurels Primary	29	24	30	20	27	21	19	30	
Space	1	6		10	3	7	11		
Goring CE Primary	60	60	60	60	63	60	62	60	
Space									
Hawthorns Primary	30	24	26	28	19	35	11	30	
Space		6	4	2	11		19		
Orchards Junior				113	150	141	150	120	
Space				7					
Field Place Inf	89	86	100					120	
Space	31	34	20						
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>38</b>		

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## **Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee**

**9 January 2020**

### **Outcome of school funding review 2020/21 consultation**

#### **Report by Director of Law and Assurance**

---

#### **Summary**

West Sussex County Council is required, under national funding regulations, to consult schools and the Schools Forum on proposed changes to funding arrangements affecting school budgets. The Children and Young People's Services Select Committee also considers this matter on a regular basis in order to provide comment to the Cabinet Member for Education and Skills.

To alleviate pressures on certain budgets proposals to transfer funding between Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding blocks were also included as part of the schools funding consultation. Under the funding regulations, any transfer between blocks is a decision that is taken by Schools Forum, although the County Council can seek to overturn this by applying to the Secretary of State for Education through a disapplication request.

#### **Focus for scrutiny**

The Committee is asked to consider the attached draft Cabinet Member decision report and provide comment to the Cabinet Member Education and Skills prior the formal decision being taken.

The Chairman will summarise the output of the debate for consideration by the Committee.

---

#### **Details**

The background and context to this item for scrutiny are set out in the attached reports (listed below), including resource and risk implications, Equality, Human Rights, Social Value, Sustainability and Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessments.

#### **Issues for consideration by the Select Committee**

- 1.1 The Committee is asked consider the attached draft Cabinet Member decision report, which has been informed by a period of engagement with stakeholders. Issues members may wish to explore include;

## Agenda Item 8

- (a) The proposals in relation to the local funding formula for mainstream schools as set out in section 2.2
- (b) Whether to support to funding any transfer to the High Needs block by not increasing the basic entitlement unit value and the Minimum per Pupil Funding Level rates to the full National Funding Formula rates (section 3.6).
- (c) Consultation that has already taken place, as set out in Section 5.

### **Tony Kershaw**

Director of Law and Assurance

**Contact Officer:** Rachel Allan, 0330 222 8966

**Appendix A:** Draft Decision Report: Outcome of school funding review 2020/21 consultation

### **Background papers**

None

<b>Cabinet Member for Education and Skills</b>	<b>Ref No:</b>
<b>January 2020</b>	<b>Key Decision: Y</b>
<b>Outcome of school funding review 2020/21 consultation</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Report by Director of Education and Skills</b>	<b>Electoral Division(s): All</b>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>West Sussex County Council is required, under national funding regulations, to consult schools and the Schools Forum on proposed changes to funding arrangements affecting school budgets. The School Funding Review 2020/21 consultation document was published on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019. Responses to the consultation and feedback from both Schools Forum and the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee have been taken into account in the development of the local funding formula for mainstream schools in 2020/21.</p> <p>To alleviate pressures on certain budgets proposals to transfer funding between Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding blocks were also included as part of the schools funding consultation. Under the funding regulations, any transfer between blocks is a decision that is taken by Schools Forum, although the County Council can seek to overturn this by applying to the Secretary of State for Education through a disapplication request.</p>	
<p><b>West Sussex Plan: Policy Impact and Context</b></p> <p>Best Start in Life: Approval of the local funding formula for mainstream schools will ensure a more equitable redistribution of funding between schools than the National Funding Formula (NFF), whilst continuing to provide additional financial support to our small rural primary schools.</p>	
<p><b>Financial Impact</b></p> <p>This decision has no direct impact on the funding of the County Council, but will determine how the funding provided by government through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is allocated out to all mainstream maintained schools and academies in the county in 2020/21.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills is asked to :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Agree the proposals in relation to the local funding formula for mainstream schools as set out in section 2.27, and</li> <li>(2) Agree to funding any transfer to the High Needs block, if approved by the Secretary of State for Education, by not increasing the basic entitlement unit value and the Minimum per Pupil Funding Level rates to the full National Funding Formula rates (section 3.6).</li> </ol>	

## **Proposal**

### **1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 In 2018/19 the government introduced a new National Funding Formula (NFF) for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Schools block. In order to avoid significant fluctuations in funding and maintain stability during implementation, although the NFF was introduced from 2018/19 it was done using 'soft formula' arrangements where the Department for Education (DfE) allocated funding to Local Authorities for the total of the schools in their area, and then each Local Authority was asked to distribute their allocation by means of a local funding formula.
- 1.2 The DfE have re-affirmed that it is their long-term intention that schools' budgets should be set on the basis of a single, national 'hard' formula where all schools will be funded directly via the NFF. However, no date for this change has yet been set. In the meantime, Local Authorities have been asked to continue to determine local school allocations under the 'soft formula' arrangements in 2020/21.
- 1.3 Whilst the 'soft formula' arrangements remain in place, West Sussex County Council is required, under national funding regulations, to consult schools and the Schools Forum on proposed changes to funding arrangements affecting school budgets.
- 1.4 The School Funding Review 2020/21 consultation document was published on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 and set out proposals for changes as follows:
  - Changes to the local funding formula for mainstream schools towards the implementation of the national funding formula (see paragraphs 2.1 to 2.27 below).
  - A one-off transfer of approximately £2.4m from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Schools block to the High Needs block (see paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6).
  - De-delegation of funding from maintained primary and secondary schools to create pooled budgets (see paragraph 1.5).
  - The charge to maintained primary, secondary and special schools and Alternative Provision College for the General Duties Education Services Grant (see paragraph 1.5).

The consultation document included spreadsheets illustrating the local funding formula options for mainstream schools and a modelling tool was provided based on October 2018 pupil census data to show the indicative impact of the proposed formula options on individual school budgets both before and after the proposed transfer of £2.4m to the High Needs block.

- 1.5 After taking account of responses from schools to consultation proposals, at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> November the Schools Forum made decisions, as required in its constitution, to approve the de-delegation of funding for specified services from the budgets of maintained schools (bullet point 5 above). Schools forum also approved the proposed charge in 2020/21 to maintained schools for the former General Duties Education Support Grant (bullet point 6 above). These matters are therefore not covered in this report.

- 1.6 The purpose of this report is to recommend changes to the local funding formula for mainstream schools and academies which take account of responses from schools, Schools Forum and the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee to consultation proposals. The changes also take account of the outcome of disapplication requests submitted to the DfE by the County Council to vary the local formula to avoid disproportionate advantage or disadvantage to individual schools or groups of schools.
- 1.7 This report also includes recommended changes to funding arrangements within the High Needs block and updates on the County Council's appeal to the Secretary of State for Education. This appeal sought approval to transfer £2.4m from the Schools block (the core funding for all pupils in mainstream schools) to the High Needs block to assist in easing cost pressures arising from increased demand for top up funding for pupils with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) and places in specialist settings.

## **2. National Funding Formula and the Local Funding Formula for Mainstream Maintained Schools and Academies**

### Options for allocating out DSG funds to mainstream schools

- 2.1 The key aspects of the Schools block NFF formula for 2020/21 announced by the Minister of State for School Standards in September were:
  - The minimum per pupil funding levels (MpPFLs) will be set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools. The following year, in 2021/22, the primary minimum level will rise to £4,000.
  - The funding floor will be set at 1.84% per pupil, in line with the forecast GDP deflator, to protect per pupil allocations for all schools in real terms. This minimum increase in 2020-21 allocations will be based on the individual school's NFF allocation in 2019-20.
  - Schools that are attracting their core NFF allocations will benefit from an increase of 4% to the formula's core factors, with the exception of the Free Schools Meal factor which will only increase by inflation.
  - There will be no gains cap in the NFF, unlike the previous two years, so that all schools will attract their full core allocations under the formula.
- 2.2 2020/21 is the third year of the National Funding Formula (NFF) for schools. This new formula is significantly different to our historic local formula, with the main changes being a reduction in the lump sum for fixed costs from £150,000 to £114,400 (£110,000 plus 4% inflation) per school, and a change in the way deprivation funding is allocated, with a basket of measures including IDACI (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index), Free School Meals and Free Schools Meals Ever 6 being used.
- 2.3 The only change in the way the pupil funding elements of the NFF have been calculated in 2020/21 as compared to 2019/20 is in relation to the Mobility factor of the additional needs funding. This factor allocates funding to schools with a high proportion of pupils who first join on a non-standard date. Previously this funding has been allocated on an historic basis, but a new formula approach is to be used in 2020/21. West Sussex does not currently use the Mobility factor in its local funding formula, but since this funding is now being allocated on a new formula basis through the NFF next year, rather than on an historic basis as in the past, all the modelling options in the

consultation have included this additional funding. In total this equates to £0.438m.

- 2.4 The increase in the MpPFLs to £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools next year is welcome. This funding factor generally benefits larger schools and those with the lowest levels of additional needs funding. As a result, there is not a uniform increase in funding across all schools.
- 2.5 Last year, following consultation, Schools Forum agreed to set the lump sum for secondary schools at the NFF level of £110,000 whilst protect the lump sum for primary schools at a higher level of £130,000. However, it was recognized that the primary lump sum value could not be maintained at that level indefinitely and would need to be reduced as we move closer to the 'hard' formula implementation.
- 2.6 The proposed financial impact of further reducing the primary lump sum down to the inflated NFF level of £114,400 ( $£110,000 * 104\%$ ) next year was summarized in Option 1 of the consultation.
- 2.7 The reason for keeping the primary lump sum above the national level last year was largely to help support our small rural schools. Given that the majority of these schools will again be on the 'floor' and not benefit from the increase in the MpPFL rates next year, consideration was also given to keeping the primary lump sum at its current rate of £130,000. The financial impact of this was set out under Option 2.
- 2.8 Since most of the small primary schools will continue to be on the funding 'floor' next year they are largely unaffected by the decision to go with Option 1 or Option 2. Generally, it is the medium sized primary schools that would benefit from the decision to protect the lump sum under Option 2, and this would mostly be at the expense of the larger primary schools.
- 2.9 With the MpPFL set to rise further to £4,000 per pupil in 2021/22, a further 50 primary schools are likely to benefit from this funding stream next year, and a good number of these will be the medium sized primary schools. Therefore, if we were to maintain the lump sum protection for another year in 2020/21 and go with option 2, many of those schools benefitting from this protection will no longer require it in 2021/22.
- 2.10 As part of its local formula, the LA is required to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). This is known as the 'floor' and for next year, the DfE has stipulated that this needs to be set between 0.5% and 1.84%. Since the Government's expectation is that the higher rate will be elected in order to mirror the real terms protection in the NFF, 1.84% was used in the first two options of the consultation. However, in order to help understand the impact of a reduced MFG, the rate of 0.5% was used in Option 3 (a variant of Option 1) and Option 4 (a variant of Option 2).
- 2.11 A higher MFG means more protection to those schools which otherwise lose under the NFF, but this also slows the progress of other schools moving to the full NFF rates, as they will have to help pay for the protection of the former.
- 2.12 The majority of respondents commented on the four local funding formula proposals.

- 16 (30%) schools responded that the local formula should mirror the NFF, whilst 37 (70%) thought that the primary lump sum should be protected, and the transitional small schools lump sum maintained for another year.
- 48 (90%) schools stated that the MFG should be set at the government's expected rate of 1.84%, whilst 3 (6%) thought the rate should be lower. The remaining 2 (4%) schools did not respond or their answer was unclear.

2.13 Following discussions around the four options Schools Forum agreed to progress with Option 2.

#### Formula Options – Growth Factor

2.14 Last year, the growth factor element of the Schools block funding formula was changed from being calculated on an historic basis to a formula basis, and as a result the West Sussex Schools block DSG allocation fell by £2m. This meant that only £2.7m could be set aside in 2019/20 for Growth Fund commitments, and as a result a £0.6m overspending is being forecast in 2019/20.

2.15 At the time of the consultation it was not known what level of Growth Funding the county would receive as part of its DSG allocation for next year, and therefore whether a similar overspending was likely in 2020/21. Therefore, in order to help discussions at Schools Forum on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 when the Growth Fund for 2020/21 will be agreed, the impact of transferring £0.6m from individual school allocations to the growth fund was set out in Option 5 of the consultation.

2.16 As an alternative to topslicing individual school budgets to pay for any growth payments in excess of the growth fund budget allocation, schools were also given the option of scaling back the units of funding allocated out for growth to a level which ensured that the value of these payments does not exceed the budget.

2.17 40 (76%) schools responded that the amounts paid to schools for growth should be scaled back in order to remain in the total funding available, whereas 6 (11%) stated that individual school budgets should be top-sliced instead. One (2%) school thought that a mixed approach should be adopted next year, whilst the remaining 6 (11%) schools did not respond or said that they were not directly impacted by the decision.

2.18 As a result of the consultation proposals, Schools Forum agreed that their preferred approach was to scale back the payments made to schools in order to remain within the growth funding that is available, rather than do any topslice. However, they reserved their right to review this position once the final DSG allocation for next year was known. It was therefore agreed that the vote to determine the actual size of the Growth Fund budget and criteria for its use would be taken at their meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 after the final DSG allocation for 2020/21 has been published.

#### Formula Options – Minimum per Pupil Funding Level Disapplication

2.19 As a first step towards hardening the formula, the government has announced that from 2020/21 they will make the use of the national minimum per pupil funding levels (MpPFLs), at the values in the school NFF, compulsory for LAs

to use in their own funding formulae. However, LAs will still be able to apply to the Secretary of State to disapply the use of these mandatory levels.

- 2.20 Due to the mandatory nature of the MpPFL, any school that receives this funding in 2020/21 will not have to contribute to funding any Minimum Funding Guarantee included within the local formula, any movement of funds to the Growth Fund or any transfer to the High Needs block. As a result, the cost of funding these options is borne by a smaller number of schools.
- 2.21 A successful request to disapply the mandatory nature of the MpPFLs would therefore enable the LA to spread the cost of these options across a larger number of schools. An example of the impact that such a decision would have on the local funding formula for the Growth Fund topslice example in paragraph 2.15 above was set out in Option 6 in the consultation.
- 2.22 24 (45%) schools thought that the LA should seek to disapply the mandatory nature of the MpPFLs, whereas the remaining 29 (55%) said no. However, from the comments made (e.g. no money should be transferred, any reduction will reduce the support we can give to our most vulnerable children, etc) a number of the 'no' comments were in relation to the need to transfer monies out of individual school budgets rather than the equity or not of including MpPFL schools in such a mechanism.
- 2.23 Following discussion, Schools Forum agreed to support the general principle that the MpPFL should be reduced where either a significant topslice within the schools block is required (e.g. for the Growth Fund) or where a transfer out of the block is approved (e.g. to the High Needs block).

#### Disapplication Requests

- 2.24 Local authorities can submit disapplication requests to the Department for Education (DfE) to make variations to the local formula to avoid disproportionate advantage or disadvantage to individual schools or groups of schools. With the approval of the Schools Forum, the County Council has submitted the following disapplication requests in order to have additional flexibility with the County Council's local formula:
- Disapply the sparsity factor criteria and use 50% of the £0.282m allocated funding to provide an additional lump sum to the small primary schools (outside of the MFG calculation). Under the NFF formula only 15 of our 53 small primary schools attracts sparsity funding. It is therefore proposed, as in the last two years, to allocate 50% of the additional monies received to the 16 schools (includes one secondary) that qualify for the sparsity funding under the National Funding Formula, and to allocate the remaining 50% in a more targeted way that will benefit all of the small primary schools in the county, by paying these monies as an additional lump sum. In 2020/21 the proposed rates will be £2,775 for those schools with 100 pupils or more and £3,375 for those schools with under 100 pupils.
  - Disapply the Minimum per Pupil Funding Level criteria. Although the outcome of the recent DfE consultation will not be published until after the election, it can be assumed based on the proposal in the consultation that affordability will be the only acceptable circumstance in which a disapplication will be approved. 80 schools will benefit from this funding

stream in 2020/21, and if this criteria remains mandatory this will mean that they will not be required to contribute to any movement of funds to the growth fund or out of the school block next year.

- 2.25 Both disapplication requests were approved by Schools Forum at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019. To date the DfE has only authorised the first request.
- 2.26 Since the closure of the consultation the DfE has also confirmed the Schools block funding allocation for next year, taking account of October 2019 pupil census data, as part of the 2020/21 DSG settlement announced on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2019. The new data, consultation responses and the outcome of the disapplication requests have been used to rework the local formula.
- 2.27 It is recommended that:
  - Option 2 is applied in 2020/21. This continues to protect the primary lump sum at a higher rate of £130,000, whilst also ensuring that all mainstream schools benefit by an increase of 1.84% on their pupil-led funding. This meets the government's expectation that all schools will be protected at the higher rate, therefore mirroring the real terms protection in the NFF.
  - The funding required to protect the primary lump sum at £130,000 will be generated by continuing to scale back the primary unit values for Low Prior Attainment (LPA) from the NFF primary unit value.
  - The local formula will also continue to ensure that 50% of the Sparsity funding that the County Council receives will be allocated to the 16 schools that meet the national sparsity criteria, and the remaining 50% will be used to fund the payment of an additional transitional sparsity lump sum of up to £3,375 for those primary schools with less than 150 pupils.

### **3. High Needs Proposals**

- 3.1 The funding regulations that were put in place in 2018/19 to allow LAs to consult with schools and Schools Forum about transferring up to 0.5% of the Schools block towards High Needs cost pressures have been extended by a further year into 2020/21. The purpose of consulting schools is to:
  - Present a range of evidence to support a proposal to transfer funding from the Schools block to the High Needs block and
  - Seek views about that proposal.
- 3.2 The School Funding Review 2020/21 consultation document set out the case for the proposed one-off transfer of 0.5% (approximately £2.4m) from the Schools block to the High Needs block in 2020/21 showing the increase in EHCPs and expenditure since 2014/15.
- 3.3 The consultation document also set out a summary of the indicative impact of the proposed transfer on schools and academies in 2020/21, through a reduced increase in the basic entitlement unit value of 3.25% and a reduction in the minimum per pupil funding level of £30 (Option 7). The spreadsheet

modelling tool published with the consultation document also showed the indicative impact of the transfer on individual school budgets.

- 3.4 21% of schools responded to the transfer from the Schools block proposal. Although responses recognised the reasons for the proposed transfer of £2.4m, in view of the pressures affecting school budgets, the majority (74% of respondents) did not support the proposals. The various comments included the following.....

*'I can understand why it's needed but I still think it's unfair on school budgets as we are having to deal with more and more SEND pupils within the mainstream school setting with less support'.*

*'While we recognise the High Needs Block needs significant funding, as a school, top slicing our budget would be a serious detriment to the mainstream needs of our children'.*

*'As in previous years, the shortfalls within the High Needs Block require a fundamental change to the High Needs Strategy - it cannot be funded by 'one off' contributions from the Schools Block each year'.*

*'Do not agree. This will effectively mask a fundamental underlying national issue and at the very least, WSCC (and other local authorities) should have to seek permission from the DFE to disapply these regulations, so that the true picture becomes clear to central government'.*

*'Not supported. The High Needs block should be adequately funded by central government'.*

- 3.5 At the meeting of the Schools Forum on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019, the forum voted against the proposed transfer, and as a result the County Council has submitted an appeal (known as a disapplication) to the Secretary of State for Education stating that it wishes to proceed with a transfer from the Schools block of up to £2.4m (0.5%), despite Schools Forum turning down the proposal.
- 3.6 The Secretary of State has still to make a decision on this disapplication request. Should the request be approved, it is recommended that the £2.4m reduction to individual school budgets be made by means of reducing the basic entitlement unit value and also reducing the MpPFL rates.

## **Factors taken into account**

### **4. Consultation**

- 4.1 The School Funding Review 2020/21 consultation document was published on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 through the Have Your Say consultation section on the County Council website. The closing date for responses was 13<sup>th</sup> November 2019.
- 4.2 In addition to the publication of the consultation document, three briefing sessions for schools were held between 24<sup>th</sup> October and 7<sup>th</sup> November, and these drew a total of 132 bookings from 74 schools and academies. Officers also attended meetings of the Resources, School Organisation, Capital and Admissions sub group and secondary headteacher executive to provide more

detailed explanations to school representatives about the local formula options and their impact.

- 4.3 53 (20%) of all maintained schools and academies submitted written responses to the consultation proposals. As agreed with headteachers' executive groups, the written responses from schools are deemed to be representative of each phase.
- 4.4 The consultation responses were discussed at the Schools Forum meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

## **5. Financial and Resource Implications**

- 5.1 The DSG Schools block in 2020/21 is £488.941m, and the changes to the local formula will ensure a more equitable redistribution of this funding between mainstream schools. All schools will receive an increase of 1.84% on their pupil-led funding and some gains will be limited by the funding cap of 4% and any scaling factor.
- 5.2 In 2020/21 the provisional DSG High Needs block is £88.912m which is an increase of £8.384m on the 2019/20 allocation. Despite this increase in high needs funding there is still an estimated High Needs budget shortfall next year and this is planned to be funded through any remaining funds in the General DSG reserve as at the end of 2019/20 and a one-off transfer from the DSG schools block of £2.4m

## **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1 None.

## **7. Risk Implications and Mitigation**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigating Action (in place or planned)</b>
Although funding for both mainstream and special schools is set to increase next year, in some schools this funding will not be sufficient to cover unavoidable cost pressures and unfunded cost burdens.	This means that these schools and academies will need to consider further efficiency measures in 2020/21 to reduce expenditure, including staff reductions. This will impact on the provision of education. Some staff reductions may be achieved through natural turnover. Others will be achieved through redundancies. The County Council is the compensatory body for maintained schools and will be responsible for meeting redundancy costs.
The NFF funding changes may affect the viability of some small schools which will require consideration of future school	The transitional arrangements included in the local funding formula will continue to help mitigate the impact next year.

Risk	Mitigating Action (in place or planned)
organisation in some areas of West Sussex. This may cause concerns in local communities, affect parental choice of school, create additional capital and revenue costs and affect the reputation of West Sussex County Council.	
As one-off DSG balances are being used to balance the 2020/21 high needs budget, this means that savings in the order of at least £2.4m will be required in 2020/21, and if the growth in the numbers of pupils with an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) continue to increase at the current rate this figure could rise by a further £5m.	These cost pressures will need to be met from increased DSG provision or planned savings through increasing the number of classrooms in maintained special schools and through the creation of additional Special Support Centres (SSCs) in maintained mainstream schools. If not then the DSG reserves will go onto deficit.
The Secretary of State does not approve the County Council's disapplication request to overturn the Schools Forum decision on 28 <sup>th</sup> November 2019 not to transfer the proposed £2.4m from the DSG Schools block to the DSG High Needs block.	The County Council will either need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make additional savings from within the DSG by cutting discretionary areas such as Area Inclusion Improvement Boards, or reduce top up allocations to mainstream schools for pupils with EHCPs, or</li> <li>• allow DSG reserves to go into a deficit position to be repaid from future years DSG allocations. If a deficit exceeds 1% of total DSG (circa £6.3m) the County Council will need to report to the DfE on how the DSG account will be brought back into balance.</li> </ul>

## 8. Other Options Considered

- 8.1 A number of different options for the local formula were modelled as part of the consultation with schools in October/November 2019. Following discussions at both Schools Forum and the Children and Young People's Services Select Committee, now that the Department of Education has confirmed the level of Schools Block funding for 2020/21 the updated data set

has been provided, and the outcome of the disapplication requests is known, further modelling using the recommended Option 2 will be undertaken to calculate the individual mainstream school budgets in 2020/21.

## **9. Equality and Human Rights Assessment**

- 9.1 The additional £8.384m that West Sussex is set to receive from its DSG High Needs Funding allocation in 2020/21, is only really sufficient to cover the existing on-going pressures as at the end of the current financial year (2019/20). It is currently assumed for budgeting purposes that the number of pupils identified as needing additional support through an EHCP will continue to rise by at least at the current rate of 350/400 per year, and therefore no funds will be available to pay for these in 2020/21. By contrast the Schools block in West Sussex is set to increase by £24.569m (before growth) in 2020/21 - this equates to an increase in funding to the Schools block of 5.35%. This therefore sees much needed additional funding going to the schools in West Sussex, but very little to the special schools and SEND pupils in the county.
- 9.2 Due to the annual increase of 350/400 new EHCP cases each year, without any transfer between the two DSG blocks controversial savings measures will be required in order to reduce High Needs expenditure next year. These will include reductions to top up funding for new placements, reductions in exceptional needs funding, freezing vacancies in specialist support teams, etc and therefore much needed educational support to this vulnerable pupil group will be cut. Even after allowing for the proposed transfer of £2.4m, the schools in West Sussex will still be gaining by 4.83% in 2020/21. In addition, mainstream pupil numbers are set to increase by 947 (0.89%) next year and these will all attract additional funding of £5.104m through the schools block formula, whereas the number of EHCPs is likely to increase by 350/400 (10%), and will only attract additional funding through the high needs block formula of £0.785m.

## **10. Social Value and Sustainability Assessment**

None.

## **11. Crime and Disorder Reduction Assessment**

Not applicable.

**Paul Wagstaff**

Director of Education and Skills

Contact – Andy Thorne, Strategic Finance Business Partner  
033022 23349

**Background Papers** - None

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee</b>
<b>9 January 2020</b>
<b>Children First Improvement – Review of Commissioner's Report and Service Update</b>
<b>Report by the Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning</b>

## **Summary**

This report updates the Committee on developments in the Children First Programme since its last meeting on 04 December 2019. In particular it discusses the publication of the report by the Commissioner for Children's Services on 17 December 2019, and the Ofsted Monitoring Visit in early December; it provides the latest monitoring information on workforce development; and it introduces a presentation to be made to the Committee on the subject of Permanency Planning.

## **The focus for scrutiny**

The Committee is requested to:

1. note the publication of the Commissioner's Report and the summary provided (Section 1);
2. note the first Ofsted monitoring visit and the draft feedback received (Section 2);
3. note the Leadership and Workforce Improvement narrative (Section 3);
4. note the arrangements in hand for regular witness feedback to be presented to this Committee and/or Business Planning Group (4.1-4.3);
5. receive the current briefing on Permanency Planning (4.4 & presentation to be delivered);
6. note the forthcoming key decisions (5.1-5.3) due to come before this Committee.

The Chairman will summarise the output of the debate for consideration by the Committee.

## **1. The Commissioner's Report**

- 1.1 In May 2019 the Commissioner for Children's Services in West Sussex, John Coughlan was asked by the Department for Education (DfE) on behalf of the Secretary of State, to report as to whether Children's Services had the capability and capacity to improve, following the Ofsted 'Inadequate' judgement, published at that time. He concluded that it did not, and accordingly the service should be transferred to an Alternative Delivery Model (ADM). This section gives a necessarily summarised account of the content of the Commissioner's report, and focuses on its key recommendations.

- 1.2 The rules for government departments regarding pre-election business prevented the publication of the [Commissioner's report](#) until 17 December 2019. The report was debated at County Council on the same day, and will be the subject of a special Cabinet meeting in public on 14 January 2020. The Leader of the Council again apologised on behalf of the Authority for the deficiencies in its services to children and young people, and for the underlying defects of leadership, governance and culture which the Commissioner has identified.
- 1.3 In reaching his conclusions the Commissioner has undertaken detailed research and analysis, based on interviews with a comprehensive range of stakeholders. This investigation included not only the delivery of Children's Services, but also the corporate context in which the service operated. Among the key corporate themes identified were:
- dysfunctionality in relationships between members and officers;
  - an opaque and inefficient style of decision-making, coupled with excessive bureaucracy;
  - an unwillingness at senior level to entertain alternative viewpoints;
  - senior management 'churn' – i.e. frequent changes in service leadership personnel – leading to lack of strategic direction.
- 1.4 In terms of Children's Services, the following broad themes were identified:
- weaknesses and non-compliance in important areas of governance;
  - ineffective scrutiny and challenge, or scope for disagreement;
  - insufficient attention to safeguarding of children;
  - lack of understanding of quality and performance management;
  - lack of focus on children as individuals with needs and wishes;
  - complex and inefficient processes;
  - dysfunctionality in interactions between the leadership, service managers and staff, giving rise to an impoverished culture.
- 1.5 Despite these very serious findings, the Commissioner does acknowledge that recent service improvements provide some encouragement that a return to sound operational practice in Children's Services is feasible. The Committee will be aware of many of these developments, which are summarised against the recommendations below. Notwithstanding these, the Commissioner has determined that, due to the problems he has identified within the broader corporate context, placing the service with an Alternative Delivery Model for the time being is essential to its recovery.

### **Implementing the Commissioner's Recommendations**

- 1.6 The Commissioner made 10 specific recommendations: these and the progress to date in implementing them, are summarised below:
1. **The Alternative Delivery Model (ADM):** This is the key recommendation, and under John Coughlan's guidance immediate steps will be taken to commence the setting up of a Children's Trust. Its formation will take some months to accomplish, and the appointment of an Improvement Partner (Recommendation 3) is intended to guarantee and support continuing service development in the interim.

2. **Appointment of a Commissioner:** John Coughlan has been reappointed by the Secretary of State for a further 12 months; he will provide strategic direction through his chairmanship of the reconstituted Children First Improvement Board, and continue to report to the DfE on the progress being achieved.
3. **Improvement Partner:** Hampshire County Council has been appointed our Partner in Practice in order to provide service development support in the period before an ADM can be formally created. Steve Crocker, the Hampshire Director of Children's Services and his team will work closely with WSCC Children's Services.
4. **Role and status of Director of Children's Services:** Within the County Council's Constitution, the legal role of Director of Children's Services (DCS) is now formally established as 'Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning' and reports directly to the Chief Executive. The Executive Director now has formal responsibility both for social care and education functions, as best practice dictates.
5. **Status of Improvement Board:** the Board has been reconstituted to reflect Ofsted priorities, Under the Commissioner's chairmanship, and is no longer 'voluntary'.
6. **Management Training Programme:** the Commissioner requires that management and staff have a common and robust understanding of quality and performance, in addressing 'what good looks like' throughout the service: arrangements are in hand to give this effect.
7. **Staff Engagement:** Arrangements are in hand to enact a process of continuous service-wide engagement, to ensure that all members of the service are culturally attuned to the expectations of the improvement journey, and professional decisions are informed by these expectations. One round of leadership team engagement occurred in November 2019, and a further round is planned for January-February 2020.
8. **Improving dialogue with partners & MPs:** The Commissioner stresses that building confidence in the Council's overall leadership and its services to children and young people is essential to corporate health. This is fully acknowledged, and an initial response is the development, with partners of the Children First Strategic Approach, discussed at 5.1 below.
9. **Corporate Parenting Board:** The Board has been reconstituted, and will now be chaired by the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People. In common with this Scrutiny Committee, the expectation of exercising a more rigorous scrutiny function and engaging closely with frontline service delivery and the experiences of children and young people, is being put into effect.
10. **Corporate review of leadership, governance and culture:** The new Leader of the County Council has given strong personal and organisational commitment to conducting a full review of these, and this approach was endorsed at County Council on 17 December 2019. An early example of cultural change is the introduction of Cabinet meetings in public; the Commissioner's Report itself is due to be debated at a special meeting in public on 14 January 2020.

## **2. Ofsted Monitoring Visit**

- 2.1 As part of the journey of improvement, Ofsted is undertaking short, focused monitoring visits on a 3-4 month basis, which will culminate in a full service re-inspection in 2021. The first Ofsted Monitoring visit took place on 3-4 December 2019. The inspectors specifically examined the Assessment & Intervention function and the role of the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO), whose purpose is to respond to allegations made against adults working with children. Alongside this, inspectors followed up on the progress that has been made across Children's Services to improve the recruitment and retention of staff; supervision and management oversight; and the efforts to reduce caseloads. A 'Position Statement', an overall self-assessment of the service was presented to the inspectors, to evaluate the current quality of practice and identify the gaps between this and 'what good looks like', as an index of the further stages of improvement required. Ofsted agreed that the self-assessment gave a realistic current view of the service.
- 2.2 The monitoring visit was helpful in assessing the progress being made and the challenges still faced in ensuring quality and consistency across the service. Ofsted will be writing a formal letter to the Council with a statement of findings, which is expected to be received on 6 January 2020, and will be forwarded to the Chairman on receipt. Subject to receiving this confirmation, the inspectors informally indicated broadly as follows:
- Some progress has been made in the quality of social work practice, particularly around visits, direct work with children and the use of tools to capture children's views;
  - Staff are highly committed and want to improve outcomes for children;
  - There is a need to ensure that the arrangements to oversee children who are privately fostered meet best practice standards, and are effectively joined up between teams;
  - Staff know their children well and have a clear sense of direction for their work;
  - There is more work to do to ensure the consistent application of thresholds, and the quality of assessments and plans;
  - The service understands itself well, and knows what still needs to be done.

## **3. Update on Service Improvements**

### **Leadership and Management in Children's Services**

- 3.1 The Executive Director for Children, Young People and Learning, and Director of Children's Services, John Readman will be moving to another authority at the end of January 2020. He is taking part in the process of appointing a successor, which is underway.
- 3.2 The importance of a strong and supportive culture as part of the service improvement has been identified in previous reports. Staff engagement sessions around the county during October-November 2019 laid especial emphasis on encouraging staff at all levels to contribute to positive organisational change, and to enter into a constructive dialogue about how

management can best support and value the workforce. The feedback from these sessions has been analysed and is being considered within the service leadership team: a further update will be included in a subsequent report. The next round of discussions with staff is planned for January-February 2020.

### Staffing - Vacancy Gap

- 3.3 The service currently comprises approximately 511 FTE (full-time equivalent) social worker posts. The vacancy gap describes posts where permanent staff are absent, as well as other posts without agency worker cover. For this purpose measurement shows a steady decline from a baseline at February 2019, as follows:

▪ February 2019	18.5%
▪ May 2019	14.9%
▪ June 2019	8.8%
▪ July 2019	6.9%
▪ August 2019	5.2%
▪ September 2019	1.8%
▪ October 2019	1.7%
▪ November 2019	2.3%
▪ <b>December 2019</b>	<b>2.2%</b>

- 3.4 The current vacancy gap corresponds to around 12 FTE posts. Vacancy gap predictions depend on a number of variables, and for this purpose it has been assumed (a) there are no more leavers than currently known (including those yet to opt into the Retention package); and (b) that all those programmed starters actually commence work.

### Starters and Leavers

- 3.5 During 2019 the number of monthly leavers typically fell from around 7FTE to half this amount. This has been seen as indicative of a more stable workforce; however, care is taken to understand and where relevant learn from the reasons for all departures. The table below shows the current numbers of expected starters and leavers between December 2019 and March 2020 (as at 16 December). The leavers include some staff previously in receipt of the retention payment (which would be returnable). It is important that this situation is closely monitored and responded to, since it appears to introduce some short-term volatility:

Month	Pipeline Starters	Pipeline Leavers
December 2019	1.0	1.0
January 2020	7.3	3.0
February 2020	1.0	8.0
March 2020	0.0	1.0
<b>Net for period</b>		<b>3.7</b>

- 3.6 Discussions are held with staff giving notice, to understand their reasons for leaving: at the moment no patterns are discernible. What can be said is that there is generally a dip in applications in December, with a renewal of interest in the New Year. Further impetus will be given to the recruitment

campaign at that time, to promote the benefits of working permanently for West Sussex. Existing Agency Social Workers have been asked to consider joining the Council on a permanent basis and certain positive conversations give encouragement. In the meantime the service continues to listen to staff about their experiences at work and what can be done to improve these, with exit data being carefully monitored.

### Agency Workers

- 3.7 The vacancy gap has been closed in part through the engagement of additional agency resource: this means that the agency proportion is likely to fluctuate between given months due to specific demand; however the longer-term trend is intended to be downwards. The agency social worker contingent covering unfilled vacancies or undertaking additional work to help reduce caseloads, currently equates to just over 15% of the total qualified social worker establishment (511 FTE approx.); the recent detailed trend in terms of full-time agency workers, is as follows:

▪ May 2019	62.0 FTE
▪ June 2019	72.0 FTE
▪ July 2019	75.0 FTE
▪ August 2019	76.5 FTE
▪ September 2019	73.7 FTE
▪ October 2019	78.7 FTE
▪ November 2019	78.7FTE
▪ <b>December 2019</b>	<b>80.7FTE</b>

- 3.8 The use of high-quality agency workers remains a key element of policy for the time being. Excluding agency workers from the Vacancy Gap calculation above would nominally increase the Gap to about 11%. The long-term intention remains to progressively reduce use of agency staff through increasing the proportion of full-time staff.

### Recruitment & Retention Offer

- 3.9 The take-up rate on the revised recruitment and retention offer refers to eligible social workers, (including some social workers within Early Help and Safeguarding, as well as Children's Social Care) committing to stay with WSCC for the next 18 months. The data excludes the ASYEs (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment, for newly qualified social workers) that became eligible for the provisions in September, many of whom have indicated a wish to be included. The current scheme was launched in June 2019, and the trend in rate of take-up is as follows:

▪ July 2019	85%
▪ August 2019	88.5%
▪ September 2019	90.9%
▪ October 2019	90.9%
▪ November 2019	91.0%
▪ <b>December 2019</b>	<b>93.0%</b>

- 3.10 A new recruitment campaign for permanent staff has been launched, under the headline: 'Be My Voice'. The interest and activity levels will be closely monitored, and outcomes will feature in further updates to the Committee.
- 3.11 To summarise, the positive effects previously reported are broadly being sustained, and are indicative of a workforce becoming more stable. This journey of improvement needs to continue over the coming months for the benefits to become fully realised.

### **Caseloads**

- 3.12 The Committee has already noted the centrality of achieving manageable caseloads across the service. Caseload targets were set in 2018 and were determined by comparing with other authorities rated as 'requiring improvement'. Targets will vary between different staff cohorts: experienced social workers have a target of up to 18 cases, while newly qualified social workers (NQSWs) have a reduced target of around 15 cases; lower levels will apply where cases are very complex and intense.
- 3.13 At the current time, four out of the eight social work teams are operating within the thresholds set. The exceptions are the Assessment & Intervention Teams (North & South), Adolescent Family Resource Team (South) and Family Support & Protection (North).
- 3.14 Broadly speaking, the current position is acceptable in the context of a journey of improvement, and remains under close management review. It is important to continue to monitor over a longer time sequence in order to establish that full control over caseloads has been achieved.

## **4. Issues for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee**

### **Participation of Witnesses at Scrutiny Committee**

- 4.1 The importance of the Committee receiving regular feedback from children and young people, practitioners and partners has been fully recognised. Not only does this give members an immediate and authentic reflection of service delivery and practice, it supports their scrutiny function and helps to address deficiencies noted by Ofsted. Above all, the voice of the child is heard in an appropriate and constructive way, enabling the Committee to place children's experiences and perspectives centrally within its deliberations.
- 4.2 There will be a discussion in January for members to agree arrangements in further detail. In the meantime plans are being made with the Voice and Participation Team in Children's Services, aimed at gathering the views of children on a regular basis, typically through video- or audio-clips which can be played at meetings. This material will align with the topics under review, and members will be enabled to raise questions in advance, to be addressed in the feedback. Alongside the material from children, relevant staff and partners will be invited to appear in person at Committee meetings, to offer a variety of perspectives on a given topic.

### **Detailed examination of key service areas**

- 4.3 At its last meeting, the Committee agreed to receive a regular sequence of updates covering areas that were subject to specific Ofsted recommendations. The Business Planning Group had discussed the programme on 25 November. This process will allow members to gain in-depth knowledge of different aspects of the service and assure themselves that the Improvement Plan delivery is gathering momentum, with a clear trajectory for positive change. These updates will be supported by witness evidence as discussed above.

### **Permanency Planning**

- 4.4 The topic before this meeting of the Committee is Permanency Planning. This term describes the process of assessing and preparing a child for long term care when in out-of-home placements such as kinship, foster care or residential settings. Permanency for children who are in the care system involves building and maintaining strong and stable relationships, a sense of family membership, stability of living arrangements and clarity as to legal and administrative matters. Understanding and responding to the child's point of view and wishes is a crucial ingredient in any successful outcome. A presentation will be made at the meeting to explain the process in West Sussex from each perspective, and its place in the journey of overall service improvement.

## **5. Forthcoming Key Decisions**

### **Adoption of the West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach**

- 5.1 In collaboration with partners across West Sussex the County Council is developing a West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach. This will set out the direction and commitment for how partners in West Sussex will deliver a shared vision for children and young people, placing children at the heart of all we do. It will be a single over-arching strategic approach based on the West Sussex Plan, the Health and well-Being Strategy and Children's Services Practice Improvement Plan for Social Care, as well as other key strategies where outcomes for children, young people and their families will be improved. It will set out how West Sussex will be a great place for children and young people, where all, including those who are vulnerable or disadvantaged, have the best possible start in life and are supported by the whole community to succeed.
- 5.2 The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People will be asked to approve the adoption of the West Sussex Children First Strategic Approach. It is expected that this Committee will undertake pre-decision scrutiny at its meeting on 4 March 2020.

### **Procurement for Training Services**

- 5.3 The Children's First Improvement Programme has earmarked financial resources to commission a range of professional services to improve social work practice within Children's Services. A Commissioning Practice

Improvement Board has been established to oversee the process, including the production and implementation of the Commissioning Practice Improvement Plan up to October 2021. It is expected that this plan will be presented at the next Scrutiny Committee meeting on the 9 March 2020 for preview, prior to a Key Decision to be taken on 17 March 2020.

## 6. Consultation

6.1 Not applicable – this is a report for information.

## 7. Risk Implications and Mitigations

7.1 For an undertaking of this magnitude, it is natural that there will be a wide range of risks, both relating to the service improvement agenda and more widely. A summary of the risk areas identified in the current risk log, and the associated mitigating actions, is given in the table below:

Risk Area	Examples of Mitigating Actions
Knowing that the service is safer for children	Every aspect of the Improvement agenda is orientated towards this fundamental issue, from Workforce through Practice Improvement, to Performance Management, Governance, Scrutiny and use of Technology: it is a whole-system issue. Specific measures include having a new Quality Assurance process, with a new Head of QA in post to ensure effective management oversight
Understanding and applying quality practice	Practice Improvement project in progress to implement quality standards and assurance
Multi-agency capacity and capability	Partnership Engagement Project being delivered under Children First; Strategic Approach in preparation with partner involvement
Demonstrating to the Commissioner and DfE that the service can continue its improvement journey	Investment Plan in place; Practice Improvement Plan agreed by Ofsted; Improvement Board/Programme Board active; new leadership team fully functional; Workforce issues being resolved; Children First Strategic Approach in preparation; County Council responding transparently to Commissioner's report; support from Hampshire as Partner in Practice

Leadership capacity and capability	New leadership team in place and fully engaged
Organisational morale	New leadership in place, with proactive staff engagement; events, weekly messages delivered; dedicated communications officer in place
Administrative support for social workers	Principle of freeing front-line staff agreed, and support plan in preparation
Data management supporting good practice	Using technology to improve service recognised as a priority; planning in hand to deliver project allied to quality improvement
Preparedness for cycle of Ofsted monitoring visits	Senior Improvement Lead planning and coordinating action streams; close liaison with Ofsted; December 2019 visit and outcomes satisfactory

## **8. Other Options Considered**

8.1 Not applicable – this is a report for information.

## **9. Equality Duty**

9.1 The service recognises the primary importance of child safeguarding, sound family relationships, good parenting and the nurture of children to fulfil their potential. The provision of the service is based on need, as determined through formal assessment protocols. This need is not explicitly related to formally protected characteristics, but any such characteristic is and will continue (as now) to be respected in compliance with equality principles, and taken into account in the way in which the service is delivered.

9.2 In terms of those with a protected characteristic, the service will ensure enablement and support across all relevant categories, and this will both continue and be enhanced through the Children First agenda.

## **10. Social Value**

10.1 The Children First agenda and measures for service recovery discussed in this report will directly support improved delivery of the West Sussex Plan priority to give every child the Best Start in Life. Enhancing the protection of young lives and support for family life will continue to build resilience and social capital, and contribute towards stronger and more effective communities. The implementation of the service improvements will also respect sustainability principles in accordance with the County Council's strategic policies.

## **11. Crime and Disorder Implications**

- 11.1 There are positive implications for Sections 17, 37 and 39 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 in the prevention and reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour, and in reducing offending and re-offending by young people, all of which are affected by the progress activity discussed in this report.

## **12. Human Rights Implications**

- 12.1 The County Council has an overriding duty to safeguard the Human Rights of children in need, and this has been recognised in the Children First agenda. The Council is mindful of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights – The Right to Respect for Family and Private Life - and has taken relevant factors into consideration in preparing this report. The processing of personal and special category data is subject to the Council's Data Protection Act policies and procedures in relation to discharging the Council's and its partners' legal responsibilities.
- 12.2 The County Council is also mindful of Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child - which states that all children have the right to be consulted and to have their opinions heard on any decision that affects them. Hearing, understanding and acting upon the voice and experiences of the child is a key design principle of the Children First service improvements.

### **John Readman**

Executive Director of Children, Young People and Learning

**Contact:** Garath Symonds, Senior Improvement Lead – 03302 222511

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee**

**9 January 2020**

### **Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee Business Planning Group**

#### **Report by the Chairman of the Business Planning Group**

##### **Executive Summary**

Each Scrutiny Committee has a Business Planning Group (BPG) to oversee the Committee's work programme and prioritise issues for consideration by the Committee. This report provides an update of the last meeting of the BPG held on 25 November 2019, setting out the key issues discussed.

##### **The Focus for Scrutiny**

1. The Committee is asked to consider the contents of the report.

#### **1. Declarations of Interest**

- 1.1 None.

#### **2. Background/Context**

- 2.1 The BPG met on 25 November 2019. All members were present.

#### **3. The role of witnesses and co-optees on CYPSSC**

- 3.1 Members discussed the role of witnesses and the best way to hear a meaningful voice through wider engagement. The BPG heard that there had been increased requests for involvement on CYPSSC.
- 3.2 The BPG felt existing co-optees as a resource could be enhanced by making use of their backgrounds to further inform the Committee's work. Members felt that the Committee would benefit from a degree of flexibility, therefore agreed not to increase the size of the committee but to establish a pool of experts from which the committee could draw on.
- 3.4 The BPG felt that establishing a pool of witnesses was a good idea however considered that the four current co-optees represented education only and there was no external input from social care which seemed unbalanced. The BPG were keen to hear the voice of children, social workers and other frontline staff. Members felt that the Committee would benefit from a much broader range of subject matter experts who can be called to give evidence, to assist small working groups or to contribute to debates on specific subjects.

- 3.5 The BPG agreed a one-off Task and Finish Group (TFG) be established to consider further how best to incorporate the voice of witnesses, giving the Committee the flexibility to involve the relevant experience at the right stage. Officers would create a paper for the TFG on how service users might be heard appropriately and effectively through work with the participation and engagement team.

### **3. Education and Skills Update**

- 3.1 The HR service provided by Capita to schools was perceived to be of poor quality based on feedback. There were mainly concerns about IT support.
- 3.2 Members received a briefing on Elective Home Education and heard there was no automatic right of the local authority to visit a home educated child unless there were safeguarding concerns, or if the child had an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Members requested this item return to the March BPG agenda.
- 3.3 A briefing was received on Alternative Provision (AP) which detailed WSCC's responsibility for arranging suitable education for permanently excluded pupils and for other pupils who, for varying reasons, would not receive suitable education in a typical school setting. There were 292 places commissioned at the West Sussex Alternative Provision College (WSAPC). As part of the SEND and Inclusion Strategy 2019-2024 a commitment had been made to remove Primary AP through provision via outreach schemes. The service was working to tackle issues before they led to exclusion and manage children back into mainstream education.
- 3.4 A brief update on Home to School Transport was provided as part of the Total Performance Monitor item, and the BPG agreed this should return as a substantive item at the March BPG.

### **4. Children and Family Services Update**

- 4.1 Members received a report on performance monitoring in response to the 12 Ofsted recommendations.
- 4.2 Members of the BPG would receive an electronic update on the impact of the whole council design on Children's Services.
- 4.3 The BPG considered a report on the commissioning of high cost residential placements for children. Members agreed this item should return to the March meeting of the BPG to allow greater time to consider the content of the report.

### **5. Total Performance Monitor**

- 5.1 The BPG considered the latest TPM data. The following key points were noted from the Children and Young People portfolio:
- The portfolio was projecting an £11m overspend, which was in line with what was expected and planned.

- The improvement plan and purchasing external placements for Children Looked After (CLA) were the key contributors to this overspend.

5.2 The following key points were noted from the Education and Skills portfolio:

- Home to school transport costs continued to be a pressure for the service with a projected overspend of £2m.
- Savings had been made by reducing the number of solo taxis, and through some staffing vacancies being held.
- The BPG considered the ongoing issue of home to school transport and asked how the service were planning to reduce the pressure. The Director of Education and Skills advised a scheme to pay parents to take their child to school was active however take up had been low so far. The Strategic Finance Business Partner advised it was hoped the additional Special Support Centres (SSCs) would help to mitigate the overspend in the longer term. The BPG heard WSCC was not an outlier with home to school transport challenges when looking at other local authorities.

## **6. Work Programme Planning**

### **6.1 Forward Plan**

6.1.1 No proposed decisions were identified for scrutiny.

### **6.2 Agree the work programme for the coming year and plan the January and March meetings**

6.2.1 The BPG agreed the Committee's work programme as at appendix A and suggested that items yet to be timetabled, specifically 1001 Critical Days Principal and Domestic Violence, be added to the agenda for the next BPG in March to consider. Other items on the March BPG agenda would include home to school transport, EHE, high cost residential placements and the TPM.

## **7. Implications**

7.1 There are no resource, risk management, Crime and Disorder Act or Human Rights Act implications arising directly from this report. However, many of the substantive reports to the Committee will have some implications and an Equality Impact Report will be included in appropriate substantive reports to the Committee.

### **David Barling**

Chairman

Children and Young People's Services Select Committee Business Planning Group

Contact: Natalie Jones-Punch - Assistant Democratic Services Officer – 0330 222 5098

**Background Papers:** None

**Appendix A** – Work Programme for Children and Young People's Services Select Committee (to follow)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Children and Young People's Services Select Committee Work Programme – March 2020

Select Committee Meeting Date	Subject/Theme	Objectives/Comments	Key Contacts
<b>4<sup>th</sup> March 2020</b>  <b>10.30am</b>	Children First Improvement Update		John Readman
	Children First Strategic Approach		John Readman
	Safeguarding Annual Report		John Readman
	Education and Skills Annual Report		Paul Wagstaff
	Woodlands Meed Update		Paul Wagstaff
<b>Future Items to be timetabled</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mental Health</li> <li>• Domestic Violence</li> <li>• The 1001 Critical Days Principle</li> <li>• Traded Offer and Capita</li> <li>• Fostering and Adoption</li> </ul>		

This page is intentionally left blank