



# **SEND CAPITAL FUND Consultation Report February 2018**

<b>Method</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Total on-line</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>YP Survey</b>	<b>4</b>

**This consultation was open between  
1 December 2017 and 31 January 2018**

## CONTENTS

<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Summary of results.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Results .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Respondent Profile .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Written Representations .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1. Executive Summary

Local Authorities must ensure there are sufficient good school places for all pupils, including those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). The Government has committed £215 million of capital funding to help local authorities create new school places and improve existing facilities for children and young people with SEN and disabilities. This funding is:

- intended for the children and young people with education, health and care plans for whom the local authority is responsible.
- to support local authorities to invest in provision for children and young people with SEND aged 0-25 to improve the quality and range of provision available to the local authority.

Torbay Council is proposing to use its allocation to fund:

- an enhanced provision at The Spires for students with Autistic Spectrum Disorder
- additional provision to support students with Social, Emotional and Mental Health difficulties at a mainstream secondary school
- expansion of Medical Tuition Services to include Post 16 provision
- provision of Access Grants for mainstream schools, private/voluntary and early years providers to bid for

The purpose of this consultation was to gather opinions on these proposals and inform the decision making process on whether they will be implemented.

The consultation was intended for pupils with SEND, their parents/carers, all Torbay schools and residents of Torbay. It started on 1 December 2017 and closed on the 31 January 2018. An on-line questionnaire and briefing paper were published on the Torbay Council website and promoted via Children Services and through direct correspondence with partners.

## 2. Summary of results

- 44% of respondents confirmed that they were in support of the proposal.
- 15% of the respondents confirmed that they were against the proposal.
- 54% of the respondents were parents/carers of a child at a school in Torbay.

### 3. Results

#### 1. Are you completing this questionnaire as:

	Number	Percent
A young person living in Torbay	0	0
A governor at a school in Torbay	0	0
A Staff Member at a school in Torbay	15	33%
A Parent or Carer of a child at a school in Torbay	25	54%
A Torbay Resident	3	7%
Other	3	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 2. Do you agree with the proposed options to be funded through the SEN Capital Fund?

	Number	Percent
Yes	20	44%
No	7	15%
Don't Know	18	39%
No Answer	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Please tell us why you gave the above answer:

This question allowed respondents to make written comments. These comments have been categorised into popular themes. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of responses in that theme. *Individual comments may be classified under more than one theme.*

#### Themes for those who answered 'Don't Know':

Category	Comments made by respondents
<b>Not enough information (6)</b>	<p><i>"I would like more information regarding how this will work"</i></p> <p><i>"Not too sure how it will affect the school"</i></p> <p><i>"Not clear about the mainstream proposal and what it will really provide"</i></p> <p><i>"Would like further details on which private/voluntary groups can apply for funding and how Post 16 provision is going to be improved in the bay."</i></p>

<b>Difficulty in targeting funding (2)</b>	<i>"Each specialist area of special needs requires funding very difficult to decide how to spend the funding."</i>
<b>Supportive of the plan but... (2)</b>	<p><i>"It seems sensible to improve accessibility to mainstream schools. I am not convinced that supporting young people with ASC or SEMH issues in special units is the best thing..."</i></p> <p><i>"I feel the money should be spent on helping children with mental health issues but not just at PCSA...other schools too."</i></p>

**Themes from those who do support the proposed plan:**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Comments made by respondents</b>
<b>Welcome more opportunities and support (6) And particularly in mainstream (3)</b>	<p><i>"Because it can give young people a greater opportunity and better access to options otherwise not affordable"</i></p> <p><i>"I particularly feel the accessibility funding will allow mainstream schools to access further funding to meet the challenges of children with SEMH"</i></p> <p><i>"These provisions will help support mainstream schools who are overstretched, and whose provision is difficult to adapt to meet the needs of certain groups of SEND learners."</i></p>
<b>Growing need (2)</b>	<p><i>"There is a high level of need across the authority without the capacity to fully meet needs."</i></p> <p><i>"We have a rising number of children with SEMH needs and little support to access for them. This is a growing trend and one that I feel we have only have small strategies to use towards this."</i></p>

**Themes from those who do not support the proposed plan:**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Comments made by respondents</b>
<b>Lack of Primary provision/ intervention (3)</b>	<p><i>"There is little or no provision for primary aged school children. If they are supported at Primary age there would not need to be so much funding later on as for the majority of them their needs will have already been met"</i></p> <p><i>"I think mental health work and whole family support needs to go on in Primary schools before the issues get worse, and they need the funding"</i></p> <p><i>"We need more provision for Social, emotional and mental needs in Primary Schools in Torbay."</i></p>

<b>Address existing provisions (2)</b>	<p><i>“There should be reduced support for the Brunel academy. This is a wrong use of money on a continually failing school with no clear direction of improvement.”</i></p> <p><i>“It doesn't address the need for existing provisions to be more robust to give children both pre and post 16 the help required. Nor the education of the service providers to help with their ability to provide what they should be on more specific EHCPs.”</i></p>
--	--

### 3. Do you have any other suggestions as to how the SEN Funding should be spent?

This question allowed respondents to make written comments. These comments have been grouped into similar themes where applicable.

	<b>Comments made by respondents</b>
<b>More resources for children with Autism (2)</b>	<p><i>“I would prefer mainstream schools to be adequately funded to support students with ASC and SEMH needs. There should be safe places in all schools for these children and adequate support for the young people and their carers. Staff in mainstream schools should receive appropriate training and understand how to support young people.”</i></p> <p><i>“More resources for children with Autism without a learning disability especially in secondary education very limited choices.”</i></p>
<b>More resources for primary children with SEMH (7)</b>	<p><i>“To give help to children with severe emotional needs. We currently have Chestnut Outreach which is for a set time limit, but when it ends there is no further provision. We have children with needs who need to be taken out of mainstream and helped in a special needs environment so that they can return and cope in mainstream education. These children are in danger of being excluded and their problems never solved.”</i></p> <p><i>“I think there should be more schools with smaller provisions attached as a stepping stone, this might well stop Chestnut from being inundated.”</i></p> <p><i>“There should be more provision for primary aged children with social, emotional and mental health issues....”</i></p> <p><i>“Year on year we (Primary School) are finding there are more children in need of additional support and although they have been lucky enough to be granted and EHCP, this nowhere near covers the cost of even a part time supporting adult.”</i></p>
<b>More provision for MLD (2)</b>	<p><i>“There is currently no provision being made for children pre 16 who have mild learning difficulties and medical conditions that make the big mainstream secondary schools in Torbay difficult to</i></p>

	<i>manage. A new secondary school or unit to address these children's needs would be hugely beneficial and I believe a place which bridges the gap between mainstream and somewhere like Combe Pafford would be welcomed by many parents of children with EHCPs."</i>
<b>More partner involvement (2)</b>	<i>"Extra hours given to the nursing teams at special schools in order to keep up with the demands of rising pupil numbers" "Could some of the funding be directed to support therapies in special schools e.g. specialist educational staff member who could liaise/ support children and their therapy package of care. They could support educational staff and be closer link with parents/therapists"</i>
<b>Extending special school provision (1)</b>	<i>"Expanding special school provision. I used to work at Mayfield and the class sizes were expanding which made the rooms feel crowded. Could try to purchase The Element school site and create a new provision on its site, but this may not be feasible."</i>
<b>Improving Post 16 Provision (3)</b>	<i>"Yes, I would like to see more money being spent on extending provision in special schools and particularly post 16 provision to ensure children can remain at their post 16 provision till age 25" "More support for parents of children not in college 18-25yr" "improving Post 16 provision in the bay for those with ASD to support independence and moving onto paid employment"</i>

#### 4. Respondent Profile

Are you?

	Number	Percent
Male	10	22%
Female	35	76%
No answer	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Which of the following age groups applies to you?

	Number	Percent
0 – 15	0	0
16 – 24	1	2%
25 – 34	5	11%
35 – 44	12	26%
45 – 54	16	35%
55 – 64	10	22%
65 –74	1	2%
75+	0	0
No answer	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Do you consider yourself to be disabled in any way?

	Number	Percent
Yes	2	4%
No	41	89%
No answer	3	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>

## If Yes, please tell us how it affects you:

	Number	Percent
It affects my hearing	2	100%
It affects my vision	0	0
It affects my mobility	0	0
It affects me in another way	0	0

## 5. Young Persons Survey Responses

A modified, more accessible consultation response form was produced and circulated to young people with SEND by Children Services. The young people were asked to identify which options they saw as important and were given the opportunity to suggest alternatives for funding.

The council received four responses to this part of the consultation process.

All of the options were supported. The development of autistic provision received the most 'votes' with 3 out of the four respondents seeing it as important; the remaining proposals received 2 'votes' each.



Other comments/suggestions put forward included:

- “We need more provision for primary children in terms of SEMH difficulties”
- “More supervision of children making correct decision in secondary schools”
- “Services for children who are homeless”
- “Respite provision”
- “More accessible parks”
- “Wheelchair access and ramps in the community”
- Mayfield – “Bigger School, wheelchair swings & more things in our playground”

## 6. Conclusion

Whilst officers are unable to determine a response rate to this consultation; there was a good number of responses and from a variety of sources demonstrating that the consultation was visible to a wide audience.

The majority of the responses (44%) received were in support of how the Council proposes to use the funding to enhance the inclusivity of educational and early years provision in Torbay.

Respondents acknowledged that the number of children presenting with additional needs is growing and that the Council has a duty to support them by providing them with the best possible opportunities to succeed. Several recognising the importance and value of offering this in mainstream settings.

The percentage opposing the proposals was low (15%) with a majority of these respondents suggesting there should be more funding/intervention at primary level.

There was a high number of respondents who responded ‘Don’t know’. This shows that they are not against what is proposed but would like more clarity. It illustrates the difficulties inherent in targeting limited funding in an area with such a wide and raising spectrum of needs.

The responses from the young people showed support for all 4 options in varying degrees – none of the young people opposed the proposals.

**In conclusion, the consultation shows that the majority of the respondents are supportive of the proposals presented.**

For further information please contact the Schools Capital & Planning Team, TDA on 01803 208260 or email [schoolscapital&planningteam@tedcltd.com](mailto:schoolscapital&planningteam@tedcltd.com)

The information used to collate this report has been collected and processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act, 1998.