The past, present and future of specialist provision

5 October 2017
Agenda for today

- 10.30 Welcome
- 10.35 The Past: context & trends
- 11.30 The Present: beliefs & policy position
- 12.30 The Future: blueprint for provision
- 13.00 Lunch/networking
- 13.45 The Future: Role of your college
- 15.15 Membership review and services
- 15.45 Depart
The past

Context, trends, analysis of data
What lessons can we learn from the past?
Context and trends

Nothing really changes

Everything changes
Context v Purpose

The context has changed...
The purpose has not...

- Language
- Attitudes / morals?
- Benchmarks
- Structures
- Systems
- Finance
- Technology
- Equipment
- Facilities
- Staff knowledge and skills
- Quality
The past... Yorkshire School for the Deaf

• **1829**: “our object is to rescue these children from that state of mental darkness...and by general instruction to place them as nearly as possible, upon a level with their fellow-creatures in the same sphere of life...without the assistance afforded them at an establishment of this kind, they have not the remote chance of learning, destitute of which, they would, of all probability, remain a burden upon their friends or the state”

• **1969**: “Opportunities for further education for deaf people should be created, not only as a matter of social justice...deaf people need special provision... we should be consulting and debating with deaf people about how best they can be served...money must be found and deaf people must be given the chances so freely available to those who can hear”
BEN ELTON
TIME
AND TIME AGAIN

If you had one chance
to change history...
Where would you go?
What would you do?
Who would you kill?

'A cracking thriller' Daily Telegraph
Common themes 1985-2017

- Funding
- Post-19 funding
- LEA/LA relationships
- Value and understanding of specialist FE / promotion & publicity
- Quality
- For example…
The 1980s

- “the issue of rationalisation being forced on members because of external economic pressures” (April 1985)
- “withdrawal of funding when students reach 19 appears to be a growing problem and... this needs to be taken up at the highest level” (July 1985)
- “discussion centred on diverse policies and practices of LEAs on funding students” (July 1986)
- “it was unanimously felt that using DHSS funding for education was totally inappropriate and if members accept this money they would be compounding a felony” (June 1987)
- “provision...varies greatly from one area to another...the adequacy of provision relies upon where they chance to live. Unfortunately, handicap is not demographically selective” (March 1988)
- “Financial and budgetary restraints have increased and this is often used to determine educational placement, rather than LEAs adopting a “needs based” strategy. (March 1989)
- “concern about the late decisions by LAs which causes enormous strain on the family and young people as well as difficulties for the education establishments” (Sept 1989)
The 1990s

• “LEA personnel made comments including the perennial problem of fees and the message that the voluntary sector was in danger of pricing themselves out of the market” (June 1990)

• “Great concern of all members about falling rolls...do we need marketing nationally to ensure that people heard about everything colleges had to offer?” (Nov 1990)

• “major problems when fees were received very late. It was agreed this was unacceptable and that fees ought to be paid in the first term”(May 1994)

• “concern that some students who had elected to attend a residential college were being directed to the local sector provision. He queried where was the element of choice for the individual?” (May 1994)

• “what is meant by ‘comparable’ when the provision is so disparate?. There comes a point when quality suffers from efficiency gains” (October 1996)
So how does today compare? Are the problems really getting worse? What is your perception of today compared to the past?
Trends: perceptions v data – what’s the reality?

1. Move from residential to day
2. Rising demand for post-19; reluctance to fund it
3. Rising numbers of HN students in GFE; increasing complexity of cohorts in specialist colleges
4. Reluctance of LAs to fund higher cost placements / declining budgets and rising cost of specialist placements
5. Increase in mediation, appeals, tribunals
6. Numbers and strength of ISCs/ISPs/SPIs
Quick quiz (1)
Residential v day

The % of Natspec member placements that were residential in 1986?

The % of Natspec member placements that were residential in 2010?

The % of Natspec member placements that were residential in 2017?
The balance between day and residential

Average number of survey returns: 30
Trends: perceptions v data

1. Move from residential to day
2. Rising demand for post 19, reluctance of LAs to fund it
3. Rising numbers of HN students in GFE
4. Reluctance of LAs to fund higher cost placements / declining budgets and rising cost of specialist placements
5. Increase in mediation, appeals, tribunals
6. Numbers and strength of ISCs/ISPs/IPIs
Quick quiz (2) proportion of post 19+ students in specialist colleges; numbers of 19+ EHCPs

% of 19+ in specialist colleges in 2013?

% of 19+ in specialist colleges in 2017?

Number of post 19 EHCPs 2016?

Number of post 19 EHCPs 2017?
% of 19+ since 2013/14 - Consistently 75-85%, trend not clear until 2018/19
Number of EHCPs post 19

POST 16

Rise in 16–25 &
19–25 with
statements of EHC
plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>16–18</th>
<th>19–25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>41,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>58,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends: perceptions v data

1. Move from residential to day
2. Rising demand for post 19 (expectations of the Act)
3. **Rising numbers of HN students in GFE**
4. Reluctance of LAs to fund higher cost placements / declining budgets and rising cost of specialist placements
5. Increase in mediation, appeals, tribunals
6. Numbers and strength of ISCs/ISPs/SPIs
Numbers in GFE

There were 15,416 High Needs places in GFEs in 2013-14 – how many are there in 2017/18?
16-25 provision numbers: rising overall, sharp rise in GFE
(overall numbers from 34k to 45k)
But are GFEs taking students away from specialist providers?

Distribution of 16-25 yr olds by type of establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GFE</th>
<th>Special School</th>
<th>ISC</th>
<th>Mainstream School</th>
<th>CCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends: perceptions v data

1. Move from residential to day
2. Rising demand for post 19 (expectations of the Act)
3. Rising numbers of HN students in GFE; increasing complexity of cohorts in specialist colleges
4. Reluctance of LAs to fund higher cost placements / declining budgets and rising cost of specialist placements

5. Increase in mediation, appeals, tribunals
6. Numbers and strength of ISCs/ISPs/SPIs
When was the sharpest rise in the number of appeals?

1995-2000?
2001-2005?
2006-2010?
2011-2016?

And which year experienced the biggest decline?
The number of appeals registered in the latest quarter (October-December 2016) was 874, which is an increase of 15% compared to the same period 12 months earlier (there were 763 recorded between October-December 2015).
• Mediation cases: 1,866 in 2016
• 477 of these (25.3%) were followed by appeals to the tribunal
• Despite national numbers not increasing, Natspec colleges are experiencing an increase in number of cases – commonly 2 or 3 this year; one college had 16 cases
Trends: perceptions v data

1. Move from residential to day
2. Rising demand for post 19 (expectations of the Act)
3. Rising numbers of HN students in GFE; increasing complexity of cohorts in specialist colleges
4. Reluctance of LAs to fund higher cost placements / declining budgets and rising cost of specialist placements
5. Increase in mediation, appeals, tribunals
6. Numbers and strength of ISCs/ISPs/SPIs
Numbers of ISCs

Number of ISCs in 1990?

And in 2016?

And in September 2017?
Number of ISCs: a growing sector?

1998
40
(2,193 students)

2016
83
(3,088 students)

2017
99
(4,903 students)
Context and trends... conclusions

- Demand for local day provision will increase: Lenehan will be critical to future residential provision
- Numbers of EHCPs post-19 will continue to increase, despite funding pressure to stop them
- GFEs will take more HNS, but SPIs will not take fewer, as overall numbers continue to rise
- Value for money and evidencing outcomes becomes more important than ever
- Our sector is growing! But how can you be part of that growth?
Be part of the growth...
Are you at a bridge/crossroads? Do you need to move or not? Who or what is your troll? What is your approach to getting across?

...and how can history / experience help you?
The Present

Natspec’s values and beliefs
What is our current position on the big policy questions?
Natspec believes...
So, what’s Natspec’s view on...?

What’s Natspec’s response to...?

How do Natspec members feel about...?

What would Natspec recommend?
What constitutes ‘learning’ for young people with high needs?

Young people’s right to an appropriate education/training

The benefits of learning for these young people - and for wider society
The range of 16+ education and training options available to young people with high needs

The particular contribution of the specialist sector
1. What constitutes learning for young people with high needs?

2. Young people’s right to an appropriate education/training

3. The benefits of learning for these young people - and for wider society

4. The range of 16+ education and training options available to young people with high needs

5. The particular contribution of the specialist sector
Natspec believes draft statements

• Do you agree with these draft statements?
• Is there anything you do not feel comfortable with?
• Are there any key areas missing? If so, what?
The Future

A blueprint for specialist provision for the next five years and beyond
Provision now

The numbers:
- 80 SPIs with high needs funding (ESFA)
- 89 Natspec members
- (75 SPI full members and 14 associates)
- 57 Natspec members with residential provision
West:
47 colleges
18.3m people

North West: 10
(7 million)
Wales: 5
(3 million)
West Mids: 12
(5.7 million)
South West: 19
(5.3 million)

East:
28 colleges
35.6m people

North East: 4
(2.6 million)
Yorks and Humber: 6
(5.3 million)
East Mids: 4
(4.6 million)
East: 2
(5.8 million)
G London: 4
(8.5 million)
South East: 8
(8.8 million)
Catchment area & specialism

Local
Regional
National
Key questions

1. What is the ideal provision taking into account population?
2. What are the numbers of yp with SEND and of which types?
3. How many local providers and what do they look like?
4. How many area / regional? How many national?
5. What do local / regional / national providers need to offer at each level?
6. What are the universal services that ought to be in every local area?
7. How much will it all cost?
High incidence/Low incidence
(Jan 2016 special school data: total numbers 107,382)

(N.B this says nothing about complexity)
Complex needs

• The higher the levels of complexity, the more likely regional and national provision is required
• Low incidence does not equate to complexity
• Not all those in the high incidence segments can be served locally
## Local providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Number and Catchment</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Provision / programmes</th>
<th>Cost / added value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School sector – all schools post-16</td>
<td>High number of options for young people to choose from Providers draw from 1-10 LAs Travel times: up to 1 hour</td>
<td>Less complex SEN, generally in higher incidence areas e.g. MLD, SEMH, ASD Also in lower incidence SEN e.g. sensory</td>
<td>Mainstream and/or discrete 3 to 5 day provision, non-residential Work based or college based courses Range of vocational areas, routes to employment and independence</td>
<td>Lower cost LAs unwilling to pay high top-up fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE sector – all providers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added value of specialist providers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GFEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi-disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialist staff and learning support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ITPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AT and IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LAs and ACL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specialist FE / SPIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Area or regional providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Number and Catchment</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Provision / programmes</th>
<th>Cost / added value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist FE colleges/SPIs (day and residential)</td>
<td>Fewer options for young people to choose from Providers draw from 10-30 LAs Travel times: up to 2 hours</td>
<td>Same as local, plus more complex and more specialist e.g. multi sensory, more challenging behaviours, PMLD</td>
<td>Mainstream and/or discrete programmes • 3 to 5 day provision, non-residential and residential • Work based or college based courses • Might specialise in one vocational area, routes to employment and independence • Specialist training and / or outreach services for local providers, LAs and other organisations</td>
<td>Added value and higher costs due to: • Higher staff: learner ratio • 24 hour packages of support • Residential leading to increased independence and better outcomes • Multi-disciplinary • More specialist facilities, staff and learning support • AT and IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFE colleges with specialist units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land based colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of organisation</td>
<td>Number and Catchment</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Provision / programmes</td>
<td>Cost / added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist FE/SPIs – research and training centres</td>
<td>Maybe the only option that can meet need well and deliver on outcomes</td>
<td>Complex and highly specialised SEN, generally in lower incidence areas</td>
<td>Discrete provision Residential and multi-disciplinary</td>
<td>Costs will vary, but generally higher than local provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector specialists (equivalent to National Colleges)</td>
<td>Draws from 30+ LAs</td>
<td>e.g. PMLD, sensory/multi sensory, complex autism, those with greater</td>
<td>Recognised as national expert on complex conditions</td>
<td>Added value as above, plus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catchment: from very local to across the UK</td>
<td>health needs</td>
<td>Outreach services and research, national training programmes</td>
<td>• Achieving outcomes over and above what is possible locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialist training and support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plus…. Individuality

Unhelpful to define level of need by nature of impairment: assessment should take into account removing individual barriers

More useful to look at issues such as:
- Is condition new, stable, changing?
- Is yp happy with local AT, progressing appropriately
- Are social opps available and being accessed?
- Is yp achieving appropriate levels of independence?
### LA Medical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Visual Impairment</th>
<th>Moderate Visual Impairment</th>
<th>Severe Visual Impairment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not fully correctable by glasses, requiring specialist advice and monitoring. May need constant awareness of lighting and careful positioning but not ongoing involvement from a specialist teacher.</td>
<td>Not fully correctable by glasses, requiring attention to print size, illumination and contrast requiring the preparation of adapted materials. <em>Agreed need for regular appropriate input from specialist advisory teacher.</em> Needs support to ensure full access to practical aspects of some lessons / activities. <em>Exam concessions and access arrangements required.</em></td>
<td>Requires significant differentiation and / or modified resources (including access arrangements) using specialist IT and equipment to be able to access curriculum. Has little functional sight or may be registered educationally blind. May be registered severely sight impaired. Needs to have access to ICT in order to read and record their work. May use aides including a guide dog to access physical environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Profound visual impairment. As P4 but requiring access to a curriculum substantially modified to take into account the effects of the difficulty.*
### ISC context model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable, comfortable</td>
<td>Stable, may need specialist support re adulthood</td>
<td>New / unstable condition(s) / expected to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving appropriately</td>
<td>Neds help to fully develop skills in core areas</td>
<td>Achievement below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to social opportunities</td>
<td>Limited social opportunities or unable to participate</td>
<td>Reliant on support to access to education or mobility and life skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing in independence</td>
<td>Needs more specialist AT</td>
<td>Limited or no independence skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with AT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not have appropriate working medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location, Location, Location
After lunch: which one are you now? And in the future?
Lunch
Agenda for today

• 10.30 Welcome
• 10.35 The Past: context & trends
• 11.15 The Present: beliefs & policy position
• 12.15 The Future: blueprint for provision
• 13.00 Lunch/networking
• 13.45 The Future: Role of your college
• 14.45 Membership review and services
• 15.45 Depart
Noah’s Ark Theme Park Destroyed In A Flood

LATEST INFORMATION

ARK ENCOUNTER DESTROYED IN FLASH FLOOD
WILLIAMSTOWN ATTRACTION WAS ALMOST COMPLETE
Discussion in pairs:

1) Describe your provision without saying local/regional/national
2) Your partner then places you in local/regional/national according to what they have heard
3) Discuss your results
4) How many of each should there be?
Feedback and examples?
Membership review and services

Discussion on how Natspec supports its members – and how members can support each other
Membership review: drivers

• Specialist colleges do not have a single legal status
• definition and boundary of Natspec membership is therefore difficult
• recent expansion of SPIs, and diversification of existing SPIs, means current membership categories are no longer appropriate
• associate category currently includes schools, yet we are defined as the voice of specialist FE
Membership benefits

**Current**

- Representation: legislation, consultations, national forums, govt, events etc
- Promotion: Website page, directory, case studies etc
- Advice and support: policy briefings, peer support, conferences, events, updates, training
- Forums: Employment, Care, HR, Tech, Principals
- Projects and partnerships

**Proposed new**

- Member section of website: threads, upload, download “Natspec knowledge”
- Therapy forum/ conference?
- Finance manager forum/ conference?
- Secondments and associate opportunities
Membership review: proposals

1. Two options for membership definition
2. Remove associate category
3. Create subscriber category for non members (income stream for Natspec and Natspec members)
4. Introduce four levels of fees rather than three
5. New individual subscriber
Option 1

- Designated SPIs
- Specialist FE colleges in Wales and NI

Members: specialist post school/FE establishments where majority of education provision is LLDD

Excludes: GFEs, schools, orgs applying to be SPIs, CCPs, ITPs
Option 2

• Post-school further education (as option 1) but including specialist units and organisations applying to become SPIs, so:

• SPIs
• Welsh Specialist FE colleges, Scottish and NI equivalents
• CCPs and ITPs with 10 or more HN learners
• Specialist units of GFEs
Other proposals

1. Introduce four levels of membership fees rather than three
2. Remove the associate membership category
3. Non-members can become network subscribers instead (access to regional networks and CPD)
4. Individual subscriber
Comments and questions?

- Please answer the questions in the on-line form
- https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Natspecmembership
Our vision

All young people with learning difficulties or disabilities can access quality education and training which meets their individual needs and supports their aspirations for skills, work and life
Navigating the bumps along the way...

From this... To this...?