

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014-2015

EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 3rd SEPTEMBER 2014

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Agenda Item 5

ADDITIONAL NEEDS FUNDING (ANF): LEARNER OUTCOMES AND AUDIT FINDINGS REPORT

Author: Gaynor Davies - Acting Service Director Access, Engagement and Inclusion 01443 744357

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with information relating to the impact of Additional Needs Funding (ANF) delegation on outcomes for learners and schools' compliance with Local Authority SEN Guidance for Allocating ANF.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Members:

- 2.1 Note the information contained within this report.
- 2.2 Scrutinise and comment on the information provided.
- 2.3 Consider whether they wish to scrutinise in greater depth any matters contained in the report.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Rhondda Cynon Taf continues to make efficient and effective use of its education budgets through enhanced delegation of funding to schools. Prior to full delegation of ANF in March 2013, Rhondda Cynon Taf spent approximately £2.7 million on Special Support Assistance (SSAs) centrally. This resource was utilised to fund support for the mainstream inclusion of children with significant Special Educational Needs (SEN). School requests for support were historically considered in central LA panels and awards agreed for pupils who displayed severe and persistent SEN. The rising cost of individual SSA support in RCT was not sustainable and different models of delegating resources were considered.

- 3.2 In October 2011, Rhondda Cynon Taf piloted the delegation of Additional Needs Funding to the Mountain Ash cluster. This process was supported by an intensive programme of training to the cluster; support and guidance materials on the underlying rationale, systems, processes provided; and threshold criteria for awarding support devised and shared with schools.
- 3.3 The success of this pilot was such that the Access and Inclusion Service progressed with the model of phased delegation to a further 16 clusters over a period of 18 months. With effect from April 2013, the LA ceased to manage the SSA mainstream budgets centrally. All ANF is now delegated directly to mainstream schools on a cluster basis. The funding system provides an improved way of distributing resources and places schools at the centre of the decision making process. The delegation of ANF ensures that:
- there is transparency in resource allocation;
 - schools as fully involved in the fair and equitable distribution of resources for pupils with the greatest needs;
 - schools have the opportunity to use delegated resources in flexible and innovative ways;
 - early intervention and preventative approaches are promoted;
 - there is greater scope for clusters to collaboratively share good practice and problem solve in relation to complex cases;
 - clusters have greater opportunity to identify training needs and to seek shared opportunities for investing in the professional development of support staff thus promoting skill development, recruitment and retention of staff.
- 3.4 ANF funding is delegated directly to 17 clusters of schools annually and distributed as part of the annual budget. Responsibility for managing and monitoring any over or under spend of ANF lies with the Local Cluster Group Panels (LCGPs) which have been established in each cluster. Key features of the funding arrangements include the following:
- ANF is generated by formula and calculated on the basis of measures such as pupil numbers, attainment, free school meals and level of SEN within the school;
 - The funding is allocated to schools on an annual basis and redirected to the cluster for allocation by the LCGP on the basis of pupil need;
 - Its the LCGP's responsibility to consider requests from schools for ANF applications;
 - If clear threshold criteria is met and there is clear evidence of prior intervention at each stage of the Code of Practice for Special Educational Needs (SEN) ANF is agreed;
 - Where the LCGPs agree to provide ANF, the panel also agrees the level and duration of this funding. The panel will take into consideration the details on the submission about the schools' proposed use of the resources;
 - The LCGP decision making and allocation of ANF is monitored and reviewed through the annual auditing process.

This report will review outcomes from the annual audit undertaken in the Summer and Autumn Term 2013.

- 3.5 Local Cluster Group Panels (LCGP) have been established in 17 clusters and ensures that resources are allocated fairly on the basis of need and prior intervention. A key feature of the LCGPs is that it provides a forum for participative and collaborative decision-making about pupils with significant SEN.

It is the LCGP's role to consider ANF requests, make informed decisions as to whether relevant criteria have been met and whether the allocation of resources is appropriate. SEN Guidance Criteria for Allocating ANF is utilised to help inform decision making and ensure that resources are allocated appropriately. When funding is allocated on the basis of individual pupil need, it does not have to be linked to individual pupils, thus enabling schools to make more creative and effective use of the deployed resources e.g. group interventions, training etc. Membership of the LCGP includes:

- a designated Chair;
- a representative from each mainstream school (the Head Teacher or SENCo);
- the link Educational and Child Psychologist;
- a member of the Special Educational Needs Administrative Services in the initial phases;
- senior member of the Access and Inclusion Service in the initial phases;
- a Team Around the Family (TAF) co-ordinator where appropriate.

- 3.6 Threshold criteria ensures that ANF is used to enhance (not replace) early years action plus/school action plus provision already made for pupils at an individual and group level in schools. The Special Educational Needs Code of Practice for Wales clearly stipulates the need for schools to provide support that is additional to and different to what is made available for the majority of peers at early years action plus or school action plus. ANF requests should only be considered if schools have already put in place support, evaluated interventions and consulted with LA support services, external agencies and parents and carers. Support should include the provision of:

- differentiated learning materials, special equipment and resources;
- group or individual support (funded by the school) to implement Individual Education Plans/Individual Behaviour Plan targets, and to deliver and monitor planned interventions;
- staff development and training;
- consultation, advice and/or assessment and intervention from LA support services and/or external agencies.

- 3.7 Only a small minority of learners will require ANF to enhance the

current provision available in schools. In order to inform decision making in LCGPs The SEN Guidance Criteria for Allocating ANF needs to be complied with so that decision making relating to ANF awards are robust and consistent across the LA.

- 3.8 This report provides information on LCGP's compliance with the SEN Guidance Criteria for Allocating ANF (Section 4: ANF Audit outcomes) and the impact of ANF on the outcomes of learners with severe and persistent needs (Section 5: Impact of ANF).

4. ANF AUDIT OUTCOMES

- 4.1 In order to establish compliance with the SEN Guidance Criteria for Allocating ANF, all clusters were audited between May and December 2013 by Senior Officers from the Access & Inclusion Service. The audit also involved the Chair of the LCGP who provided the necessary information for audit. A total of 10 randomly selected ANF applications and supporting evidence were reviewed in each of the 17 clusters. A total of 170 ANF applications were audited in total and this included learners of different ages and with wide ranging SEN. The review focussed on whether there was evidence of:

- Adherence to ANF criteria;
- Appropriate allocation of funding (duration and amount of the award);
- Supporting documentation;
- A graduated response and appropriate school based support;
- severe and persistent difficulties;
- recent external agency involvement and reports;
- lack of progress over time or regression of skills;
- parental signatures and informed consent;
- appropriate applications.

Proformas were completed recording audit findings and verbal feedback provided to each LCGP Chair at the end of the meeting. A summary report was also forwarded to cluster chairs outlining audit outcomes.

- 4.2 Key findings from the 17 cluster audits were collated and analysed. Please refer to Appendix 1 for details of the individual audit outcomes. Of the 170 reviewed cases:

- 67.1% adhered to the ANF criteria;
- 67.1% allocated hours appropriately;
- 67.1% had a suitable review date of allocation;
- 61.8% had evidence of supporting documentation;
- 68.8% evidenced graduated response and appropriate school based support;
- 76.5% evidenced severe and persistent difficulties;
- 84.7% evidenced recent external agency involvement and reports;
- 61.8% evidenced lack of progress over time or regression of skills;
- 83.5% had evidence of parental signatures on submissions;

- 65.9% of applications were appropriate.
- 4.3 There was evidence of appropriate and effective use of ANF criteria and of the LCGPs making appropriate and valid judgements in the majority of cases. Progression over time was also evident and of LCGP's evolving and developing effectively. The majority of applications reviewed were well presented with good supporting evidence and clear evidence of external agency involvement. There was also encouraging evidence of LCGPs challenging inappropriate ANF applications from schools when criteria was not met.
- 4.4 Practice was however variable from cluster to cluster and whilst there was often good practice in evidence it was felt that further improvement was required in the following areas:
- More challenge needs to be given by LCGP Chairs and panel members in relation to the number of hours provided by schools to support pupils prior to applying for ANF;
 - Interpretation of "appropriate graduated response" needs to be consistent across the clusters;
 - Schools need to ensure that a representative is sent to every LCGP meeting;
 - Presence of signatures on every submission is required. Only 83.5% of submitted applications had the required signatures. This is concerning as no cases should be discussed without the required parental authorisation and informed consent.

Within some clusters, comments were made regarding the allocation of ANF on medical grounds. It was evident that pupils with medical, physical or sensory needs accounted for a significant proportion of the overall funding awarded. LCGPs felt it was often more challenging to be strict regarding the allocation of ANF when pupils with medical needs were under consideration, particularly when medical reports were not recent. In summary, schools need to ensure that medical reports are up-to-date prior to submission.

- 4.5 In summary, it was evident from the audits that there was good practice within the LCGPs and that clusters were developing well with good partnership and collaborative working. The LCGP members felt that the processes were being developed and becoming increasingly embedded within clusters. The delegation was providing transparency in resource allocation and decision making was becoming increasingly robust. There was evidence of schools being fully involved in the allocation of ANF and this was reportedly empowering for schools. Schools do however still need to adhere more closely to the guidance criteria and ensure that awards are only agreed if there is clear evidence of threshold criteria being met with supporting evidence. This is substantiated by financial evidence that a number of clusters over allocated resources during 2013/14. Financial projections for 2014/15 suggests that it would be beneficial for LCGPs to address this issue so as to avoid escalating budget deficits.

5. IMPACT OF ANF: SCHOOL PERCEPTIONS AND DATA

5.1 In order to assess the impact of ANF delegation on pupil outcomes, schools were required to provide information on the use and impact of the allocated funding. In addition, attainment and attendance data for the cohort of pupils allocated ANF were collated centrally and analysed.

5.2 School returns highlighted that 678 pupils were supported using ANF at the time of the data collation. Of the allocated ANF awards, 55.32% related to the primary sector and 44.68% were within the secondary sector. 46.52% of allocated ANF supported pupils received either 10 or 15 hours per week. 15.99% was allocated to support pupils for over 20 hours per week.

Only 1.75% of the RCT school population were allocated ANF support during 2012/13. Of the 678 pupils who were allocated ANF support 38.05% were in receipt of free school meals; 59.44% were not in receipt of free school meals and in 2.51% of cases FSM status was unknown. This is higher than the RCT FSM population of 24.39%.

5.3 Data collated suggests that the primary need of pupils receiving ANF, primary use of ANF and the impact of ANF was as follows:

i) Schools used ANF to support pupils with the following primary needs:

Table 1 – Primary Need	%
Behavioural, Emotional & Social Difficulties	23.9%
Physical and Medical Difficulties	20.8%
Autistic Spectrum Disorders	17.7%
Moderate Learning Difficulties	15.1%
Speech, Language and Communication Difficulties	6.3%
Severe Learning Difficulties	5.3%
SPLD – Dyslexia	3.9%
Hearing Impairment	2.7%
Not completed	1.9%
SPLD – Dyspraxia	0.6%
Visual Impairment	0.6%
Multi-Sensory Impairment	0.4%
Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulties	0.4%
SPLD – Dyscalculia	0.4%
Grand Total	100%

As seen in Table 1, 44.7% of allocated ANF supports pupils with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties or physical/medical difficulties.

ii) Schools primary use ANF for the following interventions:

Table 2 – Primary Use of ANF	%
Break/lunch time support	1.39%
Group - Fine/gross motor intervention	1.65%
Group - In class curriculum support	18.73%
Group - Literacy intervention	2.28%
Group - Numeracy intervention	0.25%
Group - Social communication/literacy intervention	3.92%
Group - Social/emotional behaviour intervention	4.94%
Group - Speech/lang intervention	0.89%
Individual - Fine/gross motor intervention	0.63%
Individual - In class curriculum support	27.22%
Individual - Literacy intervention	4.68%
Individual - Numeracy intervention	0.76%
Individual - Social communication/literacy intervention	5.06%
Individual - Social/emotional behaviour intervention	11.01%
Individual - Speech/language intervention	2.53%
Medical	6.08%
Not completed	2.41%
Physical	5.57%
Grand Total	100%

As highlighted in Table 2, 45.95% of allocated ANF supports either individual or group in-class curriculum support. 32.66% was used to support group interventions and 52% supported individual interventions. The enhanced use of ANF for group interventions is a positive development given that SSA funding was historically predominantly used for individual support. This would suggest that more pupils are benefitting from the funding awarded.

iii) The impact of ANF was reported as follows:

Table 3 - Impact of ANF	%
Positive - Prevented the attainment gap from widening	21.52%
Positive - Improvements in emotional behavioural and social skills	18.86%
Positive - Improvements in social communication/interaction skills	18.35%
Positive - Enhanced rate of progress	12.53%
Positive - Improvements in self help/personal	12.28%
Positive - Narrowed the attainment gap	8.48%
Negative - Attainment gap has widened	4.68%
Not completed	3.29%
Grand Total	100%

Table 3 illustrates that 92.03% of returns from schools identified that ANF had a positive impact on pupils. No impact, as reflected by the widening of the attainment gap, was reported in only 4.68% of cases. In 92.03% of cases, improvements were reported in many areas including: emotional, behavioural and social skills; communication/interaction skills; self/help personal skills; prevention of the attainment gap widening; enhanced rates of progress; and narrowing of the attainment gap.

6. **IMPACT OF ANF ON PUPIL OUTCOMES**

- 6.1 It should be noted that measuring progress over time for pupils receiving ANF is very difficult due to the different dates that awards are made. The start date for the allocation of additional support, either historically via SSA allocation through the LA, or more recently through ANF allocation via LCGP can vary from weeks to years. Data comparisons are therefore inherently difficult.

The Access and Inclusion Service liaised with the Management Information Team to obtain the Foundation Phase/Key Stage results and attendance data for those pupils allocated ANF in 2012/13.

Table 4 is a summary of the 2013 attainment data for RCT:

Table 4 – Attainment data			
Key Stage	RCT Cohort	School SEN Cohort (SA+)	ANF Cohort
Foundation Phase	80.6%	31.21%	30.95%
Key Stage 2	82.6%	38.42%	29.09%
Key Stage 3	73.6%	26.09%	16.67%

As expected the outcomes for learners with ANF are lower as these are the learners with the greatest needs in the LA. The data does however confirm that awards were made to the most needy cohort in the LA which suggests that adherence to the LA threshold criteria for awarding support was evident.

6.2 *Foundation Phase Indicators (FPI)*

Foundation Phase outcomes highlight that 30.95% of pupils receiving ANF achieved the expected FPI compared to 31.21% of the School Action Plus cohort. A 0.26% difference is evident when comparing SA+ cohort of pupils with those receiving ANF. Of those 27 (from a cohort of 44) who did not achieve required outcomes 48.15% received individual support and 25.92% received group support (please see Appendix 2 Table 1 for further information).

37.04% of pupils who did not achieve FPI, had a primary need of medical/physical difficulties. 14.81% of cases had Autistic Spectrum Disorder; 18.52% of cases had social emotional and behavioural difficulties; 7.41% of cases had moderate learning difficulties; and 3.7% of cases had severe and persistent difficulties. Data suggests that the learners who are least likely to achieve expected FPI outcomes most commonly had medical or physical difficulties.

Nevertheless of the pupils who did not achieve their expected FPI outcomes, schools still stated in 85.2% of cases that the impact of ANF on outcomes had been positive.

6.3 *Key Stage 2 CSI results*

Key Stage 2 outcomes highlighted that 29.09% of pupils receiving ANF achieved expected CSI outcomes compared to 38.42% of the SA+ cohort, which equates to a difference of 9.33% (Table 4). Of those 35 (from a cohort of 55) KS2 pupils who did not achieve the expected outcomes, 48.57% of the ANF awarded provided individual support, 39.99% supported group interventions and 8.57% was used to support physical/medical needs of pupils (further details are provided in Appendix 3 Table III).

Of those 35 pupils who did not achieve the expected CSI outcomes, 31.43% of pupils had a primary need of moderate learning difficulties; 14.29% had social, emotional and behavioural difficulties; 11.43% had Autistic Spectrum Disorder; 5.71% had severe learning difficulties; 20% had physical/medical difficulties and 8.57% had dyscalculia. It is perhaps not surprising that pupils with moderate or severe learning difficulties frequently did not achieve KS2 CSI outcomes given the nature of their difficulties and their well below average cognitive abilities.

From the cohort who did not achieve their expected CSI outcomes at KS2, schools still considered in 97.14% of case ANF had resulted in a positive impact (please see Appendix 3 Table IV for further information).

6.4 *Key Stage 3 CSI results*

Key Stage 3 outcomes highlights that 16.67% of pupils receiving ANF achieved expected CSI outcomes compared to 26.09% of the SA+ cohort, which equates to a difference of 9.43% (refer to Table 4).

Of those 44 (from a cohort of 54) KS3 pupils who did not achieve the expected outcomes in 63.64% of the cases ANF was used for individual support and in 29.55% of cases it was used for group interventions. (Please see Appendix 3 Table V for further information).

From the cohort who did not achieve expected KS2 outcomes, 22.73% of pupils had a primary need of social, emotional and behavioural difficulties; 22.73% of cases had physical/medical difficulties; 18.18% of cases had moderate learning difficulties; 13.64% of cases had Autistic Spectrum Disorder; and 11.36% of cases had severe learning difficulties.

Of those pupils who did not achieve their expected CSI outcomes at KS3, 95.45% of schools still stated that ANF had a positive impact.

6.5 In summary, the data highlights the pupils who are allocated ANF are those with most severe and persistent difficulties and as a consequence are less likely to achieve expected outcomes due to the very nature of their difficulties. Those pupils who are allocated ANF support have to meet strict LA guidelines which includes a lack of progress over time and severe and persistent difficulties. Therefore by definition, ANF pupils who meet threshold criteria for the funding will have lower academic achievements than their peers as this is one of the essential criteria. The data highlights that the criteria is effective in ensuring that the pupils with the greatest needs are being targeted.

6.6 Attendance Data for ANF Pupils

Below is a summary of the attendance data for pupils supported by ANF. ANF pupils attended school for 89.95% of the time.

Table 5: Attendance according to SEN Primary Need	% Attendance
Autistic Spectrum Disorders	90.23%
Behavioural, Emotional & Social Difficulties	91.31%
Hearing Impairment	89.41%
Moderate Learning Difficulties	90.73%
Multi-Sensory Impairment	85.59%
Not completed	83.83%
Physical and Medical Difficulties	86.61%
Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulties	82.89%
Severe Learning Difficulties	91.20%
Speech, Language and Communication Difficulties	91.80%
SPLD – Dyscalculia	94.36%
SPLD – Dyslexia	90.93%
SPLD – Dyspraxia	94.99%
Visual Impairment	88.62%
Grand Total	89.95%

The pupils with the lowest attendance rate of 82.89% were pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties.

The attendance of primary and secondary pupils receiving ANF is summarised as follows:

Table 6: Primary/Secondary attendance for ANF Cohort by school type	% Attendance ANF Cohort
Primary	89.90%
Secondary	90.02%
Grand Total	89.95%

The attendance rates of pupils receiving ANF is significantly lower than the average RCT child or young person when comparisons are made with

2012/13 attendance data. Data for 2012/13 suggests that the average rate of attendance for a primary pupil was 93.4% and 91.9% for a secondary pupil. The attendance of children receiving FSM is also lower than non-FSM learners receiving ANF. This is summarised as follows:

Table 7: FSM Attendance Analysis for ANF cohort FSM	% Attendance
Non-FSM	91.00%
FSM	88.29%
FSM status unknown	88.55%
Grand Total	89.95%

Data suggests that there is a need for the Access and Inclusion Service to work collaboratively with the Attendance and Wellbeing Service to address this issue.

6.7 Exclusion Data for ANF Pupils

Exclusion data for academic year 2012/13 has been analysed to review if any of the cohort of pupils who had received ANF had been excluded from school. Below is a summary of the findings:

Table 8: Exclusion Data RCT and ANF Cohort		
Exclusions	RCT all pupils	ANF Cohort
Incident of exclusion	1645	69
Number of days lost	3655	123

Those pupils allocated ANF accounted for:

- 4.19% of the incidents of exclusions in 2012/13
- 3.37% of the number of days lost to exclusions in 2012/13

From the cohort of 678 pupils 8% (55 pupils) had been subject to an exclusion. The 55 pupils had been involved in 69 incidents of fixed term exclusions resulting in 123 school days being lost. The excluded pupils had been awarded a total of 619.5 hours of ANF support.

59.42% of exclusions related to pupils who had a primary need of emotional, behavioural and social difficulties and 18.84% of pupils had Autistic Spectrum Disorder. Table 9 provides further analysis of the needs of excluded pupils who had received ANF.

Table 9: Exclusion Rates of ANF pupils according to SEN 2012/13		
Primary need of pupils	Number of pupils	%
Hearing Impairment	1	1.45
SPLD – Dyslexia	1	1.45
Physical and Medical Difficulties	3	4.35
Moderate Learning Difficulties	10	14.49
Autistic Spectrum Disorders	13	18.84
Behavioural, Emotional & Social Difficulties	41	59.42
Grand Total	69	100

The table below details the schools who had excluded pupils receiving ANF and the number of days lost to those exclusions:

Table 10: Exclusion Rates of ANF pupils according to school 2012/13		
School	Number of pupils excluded	Number of days lost
Pontyclun Primary School	1	0.5
Pontygwaith Primary School	1	1
Blaengwawr Comprehensive School	1	1
Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Tonyrefail	1	1
Porth Junior School	1	1
Llwyn-Crwn Primary School	1	1
Rhigos Primary School	1	1
Penywaun Primary School	1	1
Ynyshir Primary School	1	1.5
Penygawsi Primary School	1	1.5
Ysgol Gyfun Rhydywaun	1	2
Hawthorn Primary School	1	2
Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Pont Sion Norton	1	2
Aberllechau Primary School	2	2
Gwauncelyn Primary School	2	2
Aberdare High Comprehensive School	2	3
Caradog Primary School	2	3
Penyreglyn Community Primary School	2	3
Hawthorn High School	2	4
Tonypandy Community College	2	4
Aberdare Girls Comprehensive School	2	5
Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Aberdar	2	5
Ferndale Comprehensive School	2	5
Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Llyn Y Forwyn	2	5
Ysgol Gyfun Garth Olwg	3	5
Mountain Ash Comprehensive School	3	5
Heol-Y-Celyn Primary School (incl. Welsh	3	5
Y Pant Comprehensive School	4	5.5
Pontypridd High School	4	9
Porth Comprehensive School	4	10
Bryncelynnog Comprehensive School	6	11
Treorchy Comprehensive School	7	15
Grand Total	69	123

The highest excluding secondary schools were:

- Treorchy Comprehensive School 7 incidents (4 pupils for a total of 15 days with total of 35 ANF hours allocated)
- Bryncelynnog Comprehensive School 6 incidents (6 pupils for a total of 11 days with a total of 66 ANF hours allocated)

The highest excluding primary schools were:

- Heol y Celyn Primary School 3 incidents (2 pupils for a total of 5 days with a total of 15 ANF hours allocated)
- YGG Lyn y Forwyn 2 incidents (1 pupil for a total of 5 days with a total of 27.5 ANF hours allocated)

When reviewing comments from the schools who had excluded pupils 94.20% of the schools stated that ANF had had a positive impact (please see Appendix 5). Nevertheless there is still a need to reduce the exclusion rates of pupils receiving ANF and to continue to challenge schools who have particularly high levels of exclusions.

7 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- 7.1 The evaluation has provided the Access & Inclusion Service with invaluable data regarding pupil outcomes and schools' perceptions of the impact of ANF on outcomes.

Data suggests that LCGPs are complying with the LA SEN Guidance for Allocating ANF in the majority of cases although there is still room for improvement in this respect. Financial predictions suggest that there is a need to exercise greater caution with awarding ANF in some LCGPs and to address this issue promptly so as to avoid further overspending during this current financial year.

- 7.2 It is noted that 44.7% of allocated ANF supports pupils with a primary need of either social, emotional and behavioural difficulties or physical/medical difficulties. 45.95% of the allocated support is being used to support pupils either individually or as a group within the classroom to support the curriculum. This model of delivering classroom support actively promotes inclusion and access to the curriculum and more efficient use of resources.
- 7.3 LCGPs appear to be allocating funds equitably between primary and secondary schools/pupils. The highest supported year groups are pupils within year 6 - 9%, year 5 - 8.6%, year 7 – 8.2% and year 8 – 8.2%.
- 7.4 In total, 93.03% of the returns stated that ANF impacted positively on pupils. Only 4.68% felt the attainment gap had widened following an ANF award. 53% of the allocated ANF supports individual interventions. This is a positive development as it suggests a move away from providing more costly individual interventions.
- 7.5 When reviewing pupil outcome data for ANF pupils, it is noted that Foundation Phase pupils are broadly attaining in line with their SA+ peers which suggests that support is effective in providing early intervention. However there are discrepancies between KS2 and KS3 pupils with a gap of 9.33% and 9.42% respectively. However, this is to be expected as severe needs and evidence of a lack of progress over time are necessary to access ANF in the first place.
- 7.6 Of those pupils who did not achieve their expected FP/CS outcomes school still reported that ANF had a positive impact on pupils in 85.2% of cases in the FP, 97.14% in KS2 and 95.45% in KS3.

- 7.7 Pupil's attendance data suggests that only 62.03% of pupils receiving ANF attended school over 90%. Further analysis is required with Attendance and Wellbeing Service (AWS) as attendance impacts on pupil attainment levels and an essential criteria for receiving ANF includes regular school attendance this clearly needs reinforcing.
- 7.8 The exclusion rates of pupils receiving ANF is relatively low and continued support and challenge is needed in schools which show disproportionately high exclusion rates.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The delegation of ANF has been successful. 93% of schools have identified that ANF had a positive impact on pupils. In the majority of cases, LCGPs are using the resources effectively to support the pupils with the most need and are using the SEN Guidance Criteria for Allocating ANF appropriately. The delegation has provided transparency in resource allocation and places the schools at the centre of the decision making process. They have responded very positively to this challenge. However, there is some evidence to suggest that some LCGPs need to adhere more closely to the LA Guidance Criteria so as to avoid the LCGPs experiencing a rising deficit in the delegated budget. Individual meetings have been held in June 2014 between senior LA staff and LCGP Chairs to discuss a way forward and to avoid an escalation in the over allocation of resources. Possible solutions have been explored and include: convening LCGPs to review all current ANF awards with senior LA representation to provide support; providing further guidance to schools on the level of support needed for physical/medical needs; further improving annual review processes and guidance for de-statementing pupils; and establishing a working group to ensure that the Guidance Criteria are fit for purpose for all areas of need. LCGP have also been strongly advised to reach agreement about how any potential overspends will be addressed and to ensure that there is Head Teacher representation in LCGPs if the budget position is in deficit. However, it was apparent in many meetings that clusters see the LCGPs as a means for awarding support for learners with the greatest needs and are fully committed to funding any overspend from their own resources.
- 8.2 Workshops have been organised with LCGP chairs and LA representatives to discuss the ANF process and progression, share good practice, update on any new developments and provide an opportunity to discuss any issues causing concern. Identified areas for development will be shared with clusters and further audits undertaken on an annual basis. Further focus needs to be placed on complying with the SEN Guidance Criteria and to ensure that the awards made are commensurate with needs.
- 8.3 Access and Inclusion Service will continue to support and monitor LCGPs to ensure that good practice is embedded and that the delegated £2.7 million continues to be used efficiently and effectively to

support pupils and to keep improving the outcomes of some of our most vulnerable learners. The very nature of the pupils who meet ANF criteria for receiving support is such that progress over time is going to be slow and this cohort of pupils are unlikely to meet expected levels of attainment. However, now that the Local Authority is in a position where baseline attainment, exclusion and attendance data is collated for all pupils who are in receipt of ANF outcomes can be monitored over time and intervention provided to support and challenge schools to further improve outcomes where required.

- 8.4 Data suggests that a high proportion of data is allocated to pupils with social, emotional and behavioural needs. There is clearly a need to further develop strategic work in relation to pupil behaviour and the development of Wellbeing and Behavioural Strategy will ensure that this is addressed. This strategy will be consulted on in Summer 2014.

This page intentionally blank

Appendix 1: Summary of Cluster Reports

Education & Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee - 3rd September, 2014

Audit criteria	Aberdare	Bryncelynno g	Cardinal Newman	Ferndale	Hawthorn	Mountain Ash	Pontypridd	Porth	St Johns	Tonypandy	Tonyrefail	Treorchy	Y Pant	Y G Garth Olwg	Y G Llanhari	Y G Rhydywaun	Y G Y Cymmer	Total % based on 170 reviewed
Adherence to ANF criteria	100	90	60	50	70	60	60	60	80	90	80	50	40	70	50	70	60	67.1%
Appropriate allocation of hours	40	90	70	60	80	40	60	60	80	100	80	60	60	70	90	40	60	67.1%
Evidence of supporting documentation	60	40	80	40	40	70	90	40	60	90	60	80	80	40	50	60	70	61.8%
Evidence of graduated response and appropriate school based support	50	70	90	60	60	60	100	70	80	100	70	60	60	60	50	60	70	68.6%
Evidence of severe and persistent difficulties	100	100	80	70	80	60	70	70	70	90	100	70	50	70	70	70	80	76.5%
Evidence of recent external agency involvement and reports	100	80	100	70	70	70	90	60	90	90	100	90	70	70	100	90	100	84.7%
Evidence of lack of progress over time or regression of skills	60	90	60	40	50	30	70	50	50	80	80	40	60	70	60	80	80	61.8%
Evidence of signatures	50	50	80	70	80	90	80	70	100	90	100	80	100	100	100	80	100	83.4%
Appropriateness of application	40	90	60	50	80	50	60	60	80	100	80	60	60	70	60	60	60	65.9%

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX 2

Table I - Primary use of ANF (Foundation Phase)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Break/lunch time support	3.70%	1
Group – In class curriculum support	22.22%	6
Group - Social communication/literacy intervention	3.70%	1
Individual - Fine/gross motor intervention	7.41%	2
Individual - In class curriculum support	18.52%	5
Individual - Social communication/literacy intervention	7.41%	2
Individual - Social/emotional behaviour intervention	14.81%	4
Medical	14.81%	4
Not completed	3.70%	1
Physical	3.70%	1
Grand Total	100%	27

Table II - Impact of ANF (Foundation Phase)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Negative : Attainment gap has widened	7.41%	2
Positive: Enhanced rate of progress	14.81%	4
Positive: Improvements in emotional behavioural and social skills	11.11%	3
Positive: Improvements in self help/personal	11.11%	3
Positive: Improvements in social communication/interaction skills	18.52%	5
Positive: Narrowed the attainment gap	3.70%	1
Not completed	7.41%	2
Positive: Prevented the attainment gap from widening	25.93%	7
Grand Total	100%	27

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX 3

Table III - Primary use of ANF (Key Stage 2)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Group - In class curriculum support	20.00%	7
Group - Literacy intervention	5.71%	2
Group - Social communication/literacy intervention	8.57%	3
Group - Social/emotional behaviour intervention	5.71%	2
Individual - In class curriculum support	28.57%	10
Individual - Literacy intervention	17.14%	6
Individual - Numeracy intervention	2.86%	1
Medical	2.86%	1
Not completed	2.86%	1
Physical	5.71%	2
Grand Total	100.00%	35

Table IV - Impact of ANF (Key Stage 2)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Negative: Attainment gap has widened	2.86%	1
Positive: Enhanced rate of progress	25.71%	9
Positive: Improvements in emotional behavioural and social skills	5.71%	2
Positive: Improvements in self help/personal	2.86%	1
Positive: Improvements in social communication/interaction skills	8.57%	3
Positive: Narrowed the attainment gap	22.86%	8
Positive: Prevented the attainment gap from widening	31.43%	11
Grand Total	100.00%	35

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX 4

Table V - Primary use of ANF (Key Stage 3)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Break/lunch time support	2.27%	1
Group - In class curriculum support	25.00%	11
Group - Literacy intervention	4.55%	2
Individual - In class curriculum support	54.55%	24
Individual - Social communication/literacy intervention	4.55%	2
Individual - Social/emotional behaviour intervention	2.27%	1
Individual - Speech/lang intervention	2.27%	1
Physical	4.55%	2
Grand Total	100.00%	44

Table VII Impact ANF on Excluded Pupils	Total
Negative: Attainment gap has widened	1
Not completed	3
Positive: Improvements in social communication/interaction skills	4
Positive: Narrowed the attainment gap	4
Positive: Enhanced rate of progress	4
Positive: Improvements in self help/personal	4
Positive: Prevented the attainment gap from widening	15
Positive: Improvements in emotional behavioural and social skills	34
Grand Total	69

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX 5

Table VI - Impact of ANF (Key Stage 3)	Percentage of pupils	Number of pupils
Negative: Attainment gap has widened	4.55%	2
Positive: Enhanced rate of progress	13.64%	6
Positive: Improvements in emotional behavioural and social skills	31.82%	14
Positive: Improvements in self help/personal	6.82%	3
Positive: Improvements in social communication/interaction skills	9.09%	4
Positive: Narrowed the attainment gap	6.82%	3
Positive: Prevented the attainment gap from widening	27.27%	12
Grand Total	100.00%	44

This page intentionally blank