

Please complete this recovery plan template outlining how you will bring your DSG deficit back into balance within a 3 year time frame. Please complete all relevant fields and return the completed recovery plan to financial.management@education.gov.uk.

You may wish to include brief supporting attachments with your request such as forum minutes (if links not available) - these can be added towards the bottom of this page. Spreadsheet calculations should be included on the **Financial Summary** tab.

Local Authority	Kingston
Local Authority number	314
Does schools forum agree with this recovery plan and when was it presented to them?	18 June 2019, tbc
If yes, please provide link(s) to the minutes and action plans from the schools forum agreement	

What plans have you put in place to reduce the deficit in increments over the next 3 years?

Kingston has developed a SEND Transformation Plan that looks to extend and improve the local SEND offer. This will be achieved through increasing local SEND capacity in schools and specialist provisions, introducing more early intervention support and training for schools, improving processes to ensure we are getting maximum value for every pound spent and that we are regularly reviewing the needs of pupils relative to provision being accessed so that resource remains aligned to need. The SEND Transformation Plan is attached at annexe A for information and the target savings are detailed later in this DRP template. The plan is overseen by a governance structure that will monitor progress against the plan and resolve any issues as needed. The Health and Wellbeing Board has ultimate oversight and looks to bring all local partners together to own and invest in the transformation. Although the current plan is a four year plan, it will need to be extended and revised to take account of what partners learn about what works, what is not effective and also the actual level of local need. The plan has been in place during 2018/19 and good progress has been made in reducing costs whilst continuing to meet the needs of young people. Based on learning to date it is likely that it may take longer to achieve an in year break even position. This is made particularly challenging by the level of need that continues to escalate each year without sufficient increases in funding.

Word count: 248

Can you specify how continuous improvement has reduced the deficit/ is going to reduce the deficit? This could include sharing best practice, new contracts, efficiency savings

Kingston has focused on developing more expert commissioning practices to control escalating costs. This has included working with other LAs through the South West London Commissioning Group which has assisted in controlling annual inflationary increases. In addition we have developed a central commissioning team to provide more specific commissioning capacity to ensure that SEN caseworkers can focus on developing plans with families and price negotiations can be undertaken in a more independent environment. We have reviewed contract monitoring practice in relation to ongoing placements in the independent sector to ensure that every placement has an up to date contract between LA and provider and that these contracts are reviewed annually. We are in the process of looking at how additional commissioning capacity could be put in place to ensure that checks on whether providers have delivered as promised can be undertaken.

Kingston has introduced planning interviews for post 16 pupils to ensure that the LA and young person have thought through what post 16 education a young person would like to do and how this can be facilitated locally. This has included considering both traditional college placements as well as apprenticeships and has a focus on improving independence and achieving a pupils longer term aspirations.

The LA plan to increase and improve the local education offer to ensure that as many pupils as possible are educated in the borough in state funded schools. This has involved submitting free school applications, a planned programme to incrementally increase provision in Specialist Resource Provisions and working with colleges and apprenticeship providers to develop the local offer. A more attractive marketing approach is planned to assist local schools in competing with the more commercial independent sector provision with well developed promotional processes and materials.

From next academic year we will be developing an extended early help offer. This will build upon the work that has already been introduced to ensure that there are funding support options pre-EHCP to avoid needs and frustrations escalating and also to ensure that culturally an EHCP is not seen as the only mechanism to secure funding. From September this will also include the establishment of a dedicated team to provide additional training and support to local schools to ensure they feel equipped with the skills to support young people with EHCPs / on SEN Support.

The Council is also undertaking a review of all expenditure lines to determine whether money is being used in the most impactful way as well as to identify areas in need of investment. This is likely to lead to a number of reviews regarding how services are best delivered and funded including a detailed review of therapy provision, alternative provision and associated funding models.

Word count: 451

Please provide details of any previous movements between blocks, what current cost pressures those movements covered, and why those transfers have not been adequate to counter the new cost pressures

The number of EHCPs has been increasing by over 10% year on year, with an associated cost of between £2m and £2.4m. The scale of the increase in demand means that block transfers are unlikely to be sufficient to cover the cost of new demand particularly given the financial pressures being faced by schools and that would be aggravated by significant transfers from the Schools Block. In addition transfers are now only one off and so the funding gap is exacerbated in the following year if an equivalent or higher block transfer is not agreed again. In addition to the cost pressures brought about by escalating demand there is also an in built funding gap to pay for the existing cohort of pupils. This has arisen due to insufficient historic funding to pay for the duties outlined in the Children and Families Act as well as escalating inflationary cost pressures that are not provided for within the DSG high needs allocation. School fees and top ups are increasing year on year as the cost of employing staff increases - these inflationary pressures are being passed on to the high needs block by schools in all sectors. Kingston believe that the provision of good quality services at a reasonable cost requires all partners to work together to support pupils and their families. Schools are central to this partnership working and discussions about moving money away from mainstream schools only serves to aggravate relations between schools, parents and the Local Authority. Details of historic transfers to the high needs block are detailed in annexe B.

Word count: 263

Please provide details of contributions coming from the health and social care budgets towards the cost of high needs provision

Funding splits are agreed at a multi partner panel. Health contributes £21k over two placements, adult social care contribute £351k over five placements and childrens social care contribute £180k over two placements. Total partner contributions to specific EHCPs is £552k. This excludes jointly funded contracts. Some other high needs areas are jointly funded for example the CCG contributes 73% towards the Speech and Language contract - £700k.

Word count: 67

Please explain how the LA has discharged its duties under the Equality Act 2019, C&F Act 2014 and common law to consult with those affected by the changes proposed

The equalities assessment associated with the SEND Transformation Plan is attached at annexe C for information.

Word count: 16

Please include a summary of the savings/and or measure you propose to implement over the next three years which will reduce the overspend.

S1	Extension of the early years SEN Inclusion Fund to provide more early intervention support for nought to five year olds pre EHCP in early years settings.
S2	Transfer of funding from the Central Schools Services Block where it is not allocated to a specific services to provide additional funding to meet escalating need for high needs services.
S3	Review high needs central services to identify areas that can be delivered more efficiently.
S4	Review of health and social care funding to ensure that there is an equitable division of costs between partners.
S5	Improved early intervention and school support offer to ensure that teaching staff have the skills and support they need to educate pupils in mainstream settings where appropriate. Increased access to early intervention funding pre EHCP to avoid needs escalating and further support schools and pupils.
S6	Improved approach to commissioning places in independent and non maintained schools and review of local funding models to ensure placements are delivering what is required and funded places are filled.
S7	Review all service level agreements with specialist resource provisions to better control and manage the placement of pupils within each provision and ensure they deliver good value for money.
S8	The funding and delivery model for alternative education provision is revised to provide a more targeted and cost-efficient service.
S9	Opening of new special free school to increase the amount of local provision which will be less costly than use of the independent / non maintained sector.
S10	Improved local post 16 offer by working with colleges and developing vocations training schemes and employment based pathways including apprenticeship opportunities. Improved pathway planning at an early stage to map out a young person's ambitions and identify appropriate local support.
S11	Renewed annual review process that ensures that need and effectiveness of provision is reviewed annually to ensure resources remain aligned with desired outcomes.
S12	Improvements to the timeliness and quality of EHCPs clearly evidence how children's and young people's needs can be met within local provision and reduce the likelihood of costly tribunal-directed placements or provision.

Please discuss the local circumstances that have contributed to your deficit. Please provide a brief summary of the pressures in the box below and transfer the forecast spend in this area on the financial summary tab via the appropriate link. Local authorities should consider providing budget pressures in the following areas:

A) mainstream schools; B) state-funded special schools,
C) further education and sixth form colleges,
D) independent specialist provision; E) alternative provision

P1	Need is expected to escalate by atleast 10% each year in line with national trends. This level of increasing need has an associated cost of between £2m and £2.4m. Funding is not increasing by a proportionate amount annually.
P2	The formula has not provided sufficient funding to meet the current cohort of pupil costs since 2015. The baselining exercises in preparation for the NFF have not recognised spend over the funding allocation and have therefore not been a true reflection of actual cost associated with meeting pupils needs. In addition the high needs block is impacted by year on year inflationary increases in schools (pay awards, pensions, contractual etc) and these increases have not been reflected in year on year funding increases.

DSG Deficit Recovery Plan

Ref.	Block	Type of provision e.g. special schools	Action e.g. increasing special school places	2018-19	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
				£	£	£	£	£	£
DSG Balance b/f					11,071,000	14,190,000	16,672,000	17,911,000	19,252,000
Savings (figures should be entered as negative values)									
S1	Early Years	Early Years Providers	Increased resource for mainstream schools – specialist support services (funded from HN)	(70,500)	(416,000)	0	0	0	0
S2	CSSB	All	Increased resource for mainstream schools – specialist support services (funded from HN)	(135,000)	(150,000)	(50,000)	0	0	0
S3	High Needs	All	Increased resource for mainstream schools – specialist support services (funded from HN)	(25,000)	(100,000)	0	0	0	0
S4	High Needs	All	Other	0	(200,000)	0	0	0	0
S5	High Needs	All	Increased resource for mainstream schools – training / development for staff	(195,000)	(600,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	0	0
S6	High Needs	All	Active engagement of independent / non-maintained providers in designing services and provision	(360,000)	(435,000)	(295,000)	(290,000)	0	0
S7	High Needs	All	Other	0	(200,000)	0	0	0	0
S8	High Needs	All	Other	(240,000)	(300,000)	0	0	0	0
S9	High Needs	Mainstream Schools	Capital investment in new or expanded special units / resourced provision	(89,110)	(311,220)	(242,480)	(170,100)	0	0
S10	High Needs	Post 16	Active engagement of local schools and colleges in designing services and provision	(32,000)	(264,000)	(132,000)	(132,000)	0	0
S11	High Needs	All	Active engagement of parents and young people in designing services and provision	(100,000)	(500,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(2,941,000)
S12	High Needs	All	Active engagement of local schools and colleges in designing services and provision	0	(350,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	0	0
Total savings				(1,246,610)	(3,826,220)	(2,469,480)	(2,842,100)	(1,500,000)	(2,941,000)
Pressures (figures should be entered as positive values)									
P1	High Needs	All	Increase in the number of EHC Plans	2,300,000	2,313,156	2,081,840	1,850,525	1,850,525	1,850,525
P2	High Needs	All	Difficulties arising from the funding formula	1,026,000	5,132,064	3,369,640	2,730,575	1,490,475	1,590,475
Additional Pressures (figures should be entered as positive values)				3,326,000	7,445,220	5,451,480	4,581,100	3,341,000	3,441,000
Cost reductions from impact of recovery plan				2,079,390	3,619,000	2,982,000	1,739,000	1,841,000	500,000
Total DSG forecast overspend				(699,000)					
Net in year impact on High Needs DSG				1,380,390	3,619,000	2,982,000	1,739,000	1,841,000	500,000
Estimated High Needs Block change (additional grant)				0	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Approved transfer of schools block to HN block				(1,000,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Other adjustments				0	0	0	0	0	0
Net in year Forecast Outturn Variance				380,390	3,119,000	2,482,000	1,239,000	1,341,000	0
DSG Balance – show a deficit as a positive value				11,071,000	14,190,000	16,672,000	17,911,000	19,252,000	19,252,000
				DEFICIT	DEFICIT	DEFICIT	DEFICIT	DEFICIT	DEFICIT

Key
User entry required

Education, Health and Care Plans

	Number of CYP with Statements/ EHCPs	Total HNB	Outturn	Cumulative
2016	911	£18,973,000	£23,663,000	£6,346,000
2017	973	£20,594,000	£25,324,000	£11,076,000
2018	1063	£26,701,000	£27,781,000	£12,156,000
2019	1161	£23,176,000	£26,295,000	£15,275,000
2020	1,251	£23,426,000	£25,908,000	£17,757,000
2021	1,331	£23,676,000	£24,915,000	£18,996,000
2022	1,411	£23,926,000	£25,267,000	£20,337,000
2023	1,491	£24,176,000	£24,176,000	£20,337,000

	2016	% against total	2017	% against total	2018	% against total	2019	% against total	2020	% against total	2021	% against total	2022	% against total	2023	% against total
Under Age 5	20	2%	9	1%	17	2%	24	2%	26	2%	28	2%	29	2%	31	2%
Aged 5-10	347	38%	345	35%	356	33%	388	33%	418	33%	445	33%	472	33%	498	33%
Aged 11-15	362	40%	396	41%	419	39%	445	38%	479	38%	510	38%	541	38%	571	38%
Aged 16-19	175	19%	200	21%	227	21%	247	21%	266	21%	283	21%	300	21%	317	21%
Aged 20-25	7	1%	23	2%	44	4%	57	5%	61	5%	65	5%	69	5%	73	5%
Total	911	100%	973	100%	1063	100%	1161	100%	1,251	100%	1,331	100%	1,411	100%	1,491	100%