

## TORBAY COUNCIL

Report No: **LCS/32/04**

Title: **SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS REVIEW**

To: Executive on 9th November 2004

---

### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 This report updates the Executive on developments following consultation on the Special Education Needs (SEN) Review proposals.
- 1.2 It also seeks agreement to the Director of Learning & Culture's proposals to proceed as set out in the recommendations below.

### **2. Relationship to Corporate Priorities**

- 2.1 The report supports the Council's commitment to education and inclusion. The report and its attendant links also support the Council's commitment to the Community Plan of placing Learning at the heart of the community.

### **3. Recommendation(s)**

- 3.1 That the next steps, as set out in the Appendix 1 to Report LCS/32/04, be endorsed.
- 3.2 That a more thorough SEN Strategy be formulated over the next two terms to create a clearer strategic context for the evolution of SEN Service and SEN Inclusion across education and in particular within schools for the medium term.

### **4. Reason for Recommendation(s)**

- 4.1 The recommendations allow for a settlement for a number of proposals which need action and will reassure stakeholders that further consideration is being given to the more contentious elements of the original review proposals.

### **5. Key Risks associated with the Recommendation(s)**

- 5.1 Without some aspects of the original review being developed there is a risk that service continuity will be disrupted. There is a need for continuity of provision for some pupils with SEN where the current service arrangements are not clear. The proposals in respect of the decision to resource the enhancement for Autism Spectrum Disorders at Brixham Community College are of such a nature.
- 5.2 Other aspects require reassurance without which the reputation of the Council could be at risk.
- 5.3 Overall the risks are **Low**.

Likelihood	6	6	12	18	24
	5	5	10	15	20
	4	4	8	12	16
	3	3	6	9	12
	2	2	4	6 X	8
	1	1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Low risk
  Intermediate risk
  High risk

The "x" in the above matrix denotes where the author has assessed the level of final risk to fall

## 6. **Alternative Options (if any)**

- 6.1 Progress needs to be made on a number of fronts and the status quo is unsatisfactory.
- 6.2 The original Review and the Next Steps proposals provide a reasonable basis for progressing the agenda for Special Education Needs and the links with the Council commitment to Inclusion. The main alternative is to do nothing which is not tenable.
- 6.3 The next steps proposals contain significant opportunities for alternative ways of developing the agenda whilst securing a high degree of stakeholder confidence.

## 7. **Background**

- 7.1 The Executive at its meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2004 approved consultation on a Review of Special Educational Needs Provision.
- 7.2 A wide consultation exercise was undertaken in the summer term.
- 7.3 In summary consultation responses to the more sensitive aspects of the review proposals were articulate and forceful. The consultation was open and constructive.
- 7.4 In the case of consultation with Combe Pafford stakeholders no formal discussions were held due to timing and concerns expressed by some stakeholders about the underlying assumptions of the review.
- 7.5 A range of oral and written comments were received and have influenced the nature and shape of the Next Steps proposals as set out in the attached document.

Tony Smith  
Director of Learning & Culture

Contact Officer: Terry Connolly  
Telephone no. 8024

## IMPLICATIONS, CONSULTATION AND OTHER INFORMATION

### Part 1

These sections may have been completed by the Report author but must have been agreed by the named officers in the Legal, Finance, Human Resources and Property Divisions.

Does the proposal have implications for the following issues? If "Yes" - give details. <i>delete as appropriate</i>		Name of responsible officer
Legal	No	Bill Norman
Financial – Revenue	The recommendations do not commit expenditure outside adopted estimates.	Lisa Finn
Financial – Capital Plan	Budget totalling £2m is identified in years 2 and 3 of the approved 4-year Capital Plan Budget, provisionally earmarked for "Education Review Projects". Capital investment identified in the "Next Steps" proposals would need to be resourced from within this funding. The actual resourcing would be subject to full cost estimates being identified and final decisions on the priorities within the available Capital Budget.	Lynette Royce
Human resources	There are various implications for the development and deployment of central staff including adjustments to job roles. These will be managed in the normal way and will link with the necessary improvements needed following the LEA Inspection recommendations.	Geoff Williams
Property	There are no direct implications from the recommendations of this report. Any implications arising will be the subject of separate Executive or Delegated Authority decision. If it is considered beneficial to relocate staff to achieve the stated aim of more integrated working, options can be considered as part of the ongoing staff location projects, co-ordinated by Corporate Property Services.	Sam Partridge / Chris Sexton

### Part 2

The author of the report must complete these sections.

Could this proposal realistically be achieved in a manner that would more effectively: <i>delete as appropriate</i>		
(i)	promote environmental sustainability?	No
(ii)	reduce crime and disorder?	No
(iii)	promote good community relations?	No
(iv)	promote equality of opportunity on grounds of race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief?	No
(v)	reduce (or eliminate) unlawful discrimination (including indirect discrimination)?	No

### Part 3

The author of the report must complete this section.

	<i>delete as appropriate</i>	If "Yes", give details
Does the proposal have implications for any other Directorates?	No	

### Part 4

Is this proposal in accordance with (i.e. not contrary to) the Council's budget or its Policy Framework?		<i>delete as appropriate</i>
		Yes
1.	If "No" - give details of the nature and extent of consultation with stakeholders and the relevant overview and scrutiny body.	
2.	If "Yes" - details and outcome of consultation, if appropriate.	

### Part 5

Is the proposal a Key Decision in relation to an Executive function?	<i>delete as appropriate</i>	If "Yes" - give Reference Number
	No	

### Part 6

#### Wards

#### Appendices

Appendix 1

Next Steps Proposals

#### Documents available in Members' Room

#### Background Papers:

Report LCS/9/04 Review of Special Educational Needs Provision