

**CHILDREN AND FAMILIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****MONDAY 9 SEPTEMBER 2013****CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF OAKFIELD SCHOOL****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S  
SERVICE****Purpose of Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to enable the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee to comment on the consultation on future options for Oakfield School.

**Policy Framework and Previous Decision(s)**

2. The Cabinet on 20 December 2011 authorised the Director of Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) to consult on changes to services, including a 10% reduction in behaviour support services provided by the Local Authority for schools.
3. On 26 March 2012 the Cabinet agreed the report of the Scrutiny Review Panel on Special Educational Needs.
4. On 8 May 2012 the Cabinet agreed the future direction of CYPS including a service restructure and the future role of behaviour partnerships.
5. The Schools Forum, on 20 February 2013, agreed transitional funding to Oakfield School as a result of School Funding Reform when considering the 2013/14 Schools Budget.

**Background**

6. Oakfield School is formally registered as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), with a remit to educate children who cannot attend mainstream schools because of behavioural issues. A series of local and national developments open up the potential to develop further the ways in which current provision in Leicestershire is organised for these children and young people. Three key drivers of change concern national policy, quality of provision, and financial sustainability.
7. Nationally, the Taylor review of PRUs and Alternative Provision published in March 2012 by the Department for Education sets an agenda for improvement

in the sector including more autonomy for PRUs, and a long term expectation that schools will take control of the commissioning of Alternative Provision.

8. Alternative Provision is the term used to describe educational packages that include time out of school on planned activities that appeal to an individual young person's skills and interests. They include a wide range of activities and providers, from small private organisations to larger Further Education Colleges. Planned and supported well, these opportunities help young people who have become disillusioned and demotivated with the standard school curriculum to re-engage with learning, enjoy success, and achieve accredited outcomes. The Taylor review recognised the importance of this kind of provision in helping young people with behaviour difficulties re-kindle their enthusiasm for education. It argued that schools should become the main commissioners of this kind of provision in the future, rather than Local Authorities, to promote local flexibility and innovation.
9. Leicestershire has a tradition of innovation and success in this area. Local Behaviour Partnerships have been developing their work across all Leicestershire secondary schools and academies since 2005. Led by Headteachers, five Behaviour Partnerships around the county (South Leicestershire, Hinckley and Bosworth, North West Leicestershire, Charnwood and finally, Melton) include all secondary schools and academies in the county. An initial brief around agreeing priority cases for additional support and PRU placement has been extended to include managing a key stage 4 devolved Alternative Programme commissioning budget, and will further develop in September 2013 when central behaviour support services close, as agreed by Cabinet in May 2012, and the responsibilities of these services transfer to partnerships.
10. Oakfield School was judged by Ofsted to require special measures in May 2012. Considerable resources have been deployed by the Local Authority to support the improvement plan, including enhanced senior management capacity, new management committee, and additional resources to enhance staffing. Inspectors returned to review progress in November 2012 and again in February 2013. On both occasions, progress was judged to be "reasonable". A further review during the summer term 2013 has concluded that progress is inadequate.
11. New funding arrangements for PRUs were introduced nationally from April 2013. All costs of provision must be detailed as per pupil amounts. The high costs of each pupil placement resulting from this new approach will make schools look for alternative ways of meeting needs at lower costs. This will impact the ongoing financial stability of Oakfield School.
12. Underperforming Schools and PRUs are being encouraged by the Department for Education to move into sponsored academy arrangements. The DfE will have rising expectations of the local authority to consider this option as a result of continuing underperformance.

## **Proposals/Options**

13. The following options are being proposed for consultation:

**Option 1:**

Close all PRU provision and devolve resources to behaviour partnerships.

This option would enable secondary schools to make more flexible local provision for young people who have been excluded or who may be at risk of permanent exclusion. However, primary pupils are educated full time at the PRU and Primary Behaviour Partnerships are not as well developed as the secondary groupings, although they are keen to innovate.

**Option 2:**

Seek an academy sponsor for the whole of the PRU.

This option would deliver the DfE expectation that schools in difficulty are provided with a sponsor. However, it would negate the successful work of the Behaviour Partnerships at secondary level, and miss an opportunity to extend their work.

**Option 3:**

Close and devolve to schools key stage 3 PRU provision, and seek academy sponsors for primary provision only.

This option would allow separate development paths for primary and secondary provision, and could potentially provide additional capacity to support improvement work in the Primary PRU. However, this option could leave the primary provision with higher fixed costs because it occupies a site designed for a larger group of young people.

**Option 4:**

Devolve the costs of and responsibility for key stage 3 provision to Behaviour Partnerships, and look for locality-based solutions for key stage 1 and key stage 2, in the medium term.

This option takes account of the different paces of development of partnership working at primary and secondary. However, it does not provide a quick solution for primary provision.

## **Consultations**

14. A 14 week consultation is proposed to consider future arrangements for PRU provision in Leicestershire, commencing on Friday 12 July and closing on Friday 18 October. This will ensure that six weeks of the consultation period falls during the autumn term. The following issues should be addressed:
- (a) Has the merger of primary and secondary provision in September 2011 been successful?
  - (b) Should there be different futures for primary and secondary provision?

- (c) Can secondary behaviour partnerships take over the functions of the secondary PRU provision?
  - (d) Would an academy sponsor speed the improvement of the provision?
  - (e) What is the relationship with the work of the Leicestershire Educational Excellence Partnership (LEEP)?
  - (f) What is the most cost effective option that secures the right outcomes of children and young people?
15. Other Options may be proposed by respondents to the consultation and these will be similarly considered. The consultation will need to seek the views of:
- (a) Staff, pupils, parents, and management committee members of Oakfield
  - (b) Leicestershire headteachers
  - (c) Leicestershire parent partnership and parents of children with special educational needs
  - (d) The Leicestershire community (via the website);
  - (e) Leicestershire County Council departments (property, finance, legal services, etc.).

The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet on 20 November 2013, together with a proposed way forward for consideration.

### **Resource Implications**

16. The Department for Education funding reform requires PRUs to be funded at £8,000 per commissioned place with 'top-up' funding paid only for the places that are occupied (previously PRUs received funding for the places available rather than occupied). A single place in the PRU is likely to cost in the region of £30,000 for a year. Members of Schools Forum have expressed concern that they will be unwilling or unable to meet these costs. Schools Forum has agreed to maintain 2012/13 funding levels for Oakfield and retain the current commissioning arrangements, whereby places are fully funded by the LA. This is not sustainable. For 2013/14 Oakfield has a budget of £1.56m and has 51 places available.
17. Oakfield School is funded through the ring fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The allocation of increased resources over and above the formula allocation for Oakfield School is not a sustainable option. The Director of Resources has been consulted about the contents of this report.

### **Timetable for Decisions**

18. Reports on the outcomes of consultation will be considered by the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 18 November 2013 together with a proposed way forward for consideration.
19. A report will then be submitted to the Cabinet on 20 November 2013 detailing the results of consultation together with a proposed way forward for consideration.

**Conclusions**

20. The Taylor review of provision for children with behaviour difficulties encourages innovation and development through stronger local control of commissioning by schools. Leicestershire's long term work encouraging secondary schools and academies to co-operate on this area of provision through behaviour partnerships provides an opportunity to redevelop the provision made at Oakfield School.

**Equal Opportunities Implications**

21. An Equality Impact Assessment is in draft form and will be completed through the consultation.

**Background Papers**

22. Taylor Review, March 2012:  
<http://education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/behaviour/b00204776/taylor-review-of-alternative-provision>

**Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure**

23. Mr G. Welsh CC.

**Officer(s) to Contact**

24. Lesley Hagger, Director of Children and Young People's Service  
Tel: (0116) 305 6300 E-mail: [lesley.hagger@leics.gov.uk](mailto:lesley.hagger@leics.gov.uk)

Gill Weston, Assistant Director, Education and Learning  
Tel: (0116 305 7813) E-mail: [gill.weston@leics.gov.uk](mailto:gill.weston@leics.gov.uk)

Charlie Palmer, Head of Strategy for Vulnerable Groups  
Tel: (0116) 305 6767 E-mail: [charlie.palmer@leics.gov.uk](mailto:charlie.palmer@leics.gov.uk)

**List of Appendices**

25. Appendix A: Report to Cabinet 9 July 2013

**CABINET – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2013****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND  
YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE****CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF OAKFIELD SCHOOL****PART A****Purpose of Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek agreement to the undertaking of a consultation on the future of Oakfield School.

**Recommendations**

2. The Cabinet is recommended to agree to consult on future options for Oakfield School.

**Reasons for Recommendations**

3. Oakfield School is formally registered as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), with a remit to educate children who cannot attend mainstream schools because of behavioural issues. A series of local and national developments open up the potential to develop further the ways in which current provision in Leicestershire is organised for vulnerable and challenging children and young people. Three key drivers of change concern financial sustainability, quality of provision, and national policy.
4. Nationally, The Taylor review of PRUs and Alternative Provision published in March 2012 sets an agenda for improvement in the sector including more autonomy for PRUs, and a long term expectation that schools will take control of the commissioning of Alternative Provision.
5. Locally, Behaviour Partnerships have been developing their work across all Leicestershire secondary schools and academies since 2005. An initial brief around agreeing priority cases for additional support and PRU placement has been extended to include managing a key stage 4 devolved Alternative Programme commissioning budget, and will further develop in September 2013 when central behaviour support services close, as agreed reported to the Cabinet in May 2012 and their responsibilities transfer to partnerships.
6. Oakfield School was judged by Ofsted to require special measures in May 2012. Considerable resources have been deployed by the local authority to

support the improvement plan, including enhanced senior management capacity, new management committee, and additional resources to enhance staffing. Inspectors returned to review progress in November 2012 and again in February 2013. On both occasions, progress was judged to be “reasonable”. A further review during the summer term 2013 has concluded that progress is inadequate.

7. New funding arrangements for PRUs were introduced nationally from April 2013. All costs of provision must be detailed as per pupil amounts. The high costs of each pupil placement resulting from this new approach will make schools look for alternative ways of meeting needs at lower costs. This will impact the ongoing financial stability of Oakfield School.
8. Underperforming Schools and PRUs are being encouraged by the Department for Education to move into sponsored academy arrangements. The DfE will have rising expectations of the local authority to consider this option as a result of continuing underperformance.

### **Timetable for Decisions (including Scrutiny)**

9. Subject to Cabinet approval to go out to consultation, reports will be considered by the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 9 September 2013 and then on 18 November 2013 to consider the results of the consultation and proposals arising.
10. A report will then be submitted to the Cabinet on 20 November 2013: detailing the results of consultation and to consider proposals for the future of the PRU.

### **Policy Framework and Previous Decisions**

11. The Cabinet, on 20 December 2011, authorised the Director of Children and Young People’s Service (CYPS) to consult on changes to services, including a 10% reduction in behaviour support services.
12. On 26 March 2012 the Cabinet gave its approval to a report of the Scrutiny Review Panel on Special Educational Needs.
13. On 8 May 2012 the Cabinet approved the future direction of CYPS including a service restructure and the future role of behaviour partnerships.
14. The Schools Forum, on 20 February 2013, decided to provide transitional funding to Oakfield PRU as a result of School Funding Reform when considering the 2013/14 Schools Budget.

### **Resource Implications**

15. The Department for Education funding reform requires PRUs to be funded at £8,000 per commissioned place with ‘top-up’ funding paid only for the places that are occupied (previously PRUs received funding for the places available rather than occupied). A single place in the PRU is likely to cost in the region of £30,000 for a year. Schools have expressed concern that they will be

unwilling or unable to meet these costs. For the present, Schools Forum has agreed to maintain 2012/13 funding levels for Oakfield and retain the current commissioning arrangements. This is not sustainable. For 2013/14 Oakfield has a budget of £1.56m and has 51 places available.

16. Oakfield School is funded through the ring fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The allocation of increased resources over and above the formula allocation for Oakfield School is not a sustainable option. The Director of Resources has been consulted about the contents of this report.

#### **Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure**

17. Mr D. Jennings CC.

#### **Officers to Contact**

18. Lesley Hagger, Director of Children and Young People's Service  
Tel: (0116) 305 6300 E-mail: [lesley.hagger@leics.gov.uk](mailto:lesley.hagger@leics.gov.uk)  
  
Gill Weston, Assistant Director, Education and Learning  
Tel: (0116) 305 7813 E-mail: [gill.weston@leics.gov.uk](mailto:gill.weston@leics.gov.uk)  
  
Charlie Palmer, Head of Strategy for Vulnerable Groups  
Tel: (0116) 305 6767 E-mail: [charlie.palmer@leics.gov.uk](mailto:charlie.palmer@leics.gov.uk)



## **PART B**

### **Background**

19. Section 19 of the Education Act 1996 requires local authorities to make suitable educational provision for children and young people who cannot access mainstream education.
20. PRUs have been used by many local authorities to make such provision for vulnerable and challenging children and young people, whose behaviour prevents them accessing mainstream schooling. PRU's are not schools – they are the local authority alternative to schools. Since February 2008 they have been governed through Management Committees, and from April 2013 they have had a delegated budget. From September 2012, excellent PRUs were able to convert to Academy status, and the Department for Education is keen to see failing PRU's move into Sponsored Academy status. Ofsted inspect PRU's using the same framework for inspection as for schools.
21. At a national level, during this period the Coalition Government commissioned a review of support for children and young people with behaviour difficulties (vulnerable and challenging) as well as reforming the funding arrangements for young people needing either alternative provision or special educational provision. The Taylor review<sup>1</sup> of PRU and Alternative Provision proposed that schools should take a more prominent role in provision for permanently excluded pupils, and work collectively to make such provision.
22. The review welcomed the work of Behaviour Partnerships in local areas, where schools co-operate to ensure the vulnerable and challenging young people from across their area receive bespoke educational programmes, including elements of Alternative Provision and in-school provision, and schools co-operate to ensure such pupils are placed quickly where they are out of school. Leicestershire secondary schools and academies are embracing this new agenda, and are keen to make provision for young people who might otherwise attend the PRU. However it is imperative that the local authority is able to fulfil its statutory obligations for excluded pupils in such an arrangement.
23. There is currently a national trial taking place in 11 local authorities to improve the education of children who have been permanently excluded from school which sees schools taking on responsibility for ensuring that these children and young people continue to receive a good education. This enables schools, working in partnership with each other, and with the local authority, to try out new ways of tackling challenging behaviour, and sees schools, rather than the local authority, placing children in appropriate Alternative Provision. The school, or partnership of schools, commissions such provision with devolved funding from local authorities, and is held accountable for pupils' attainment and attendance. The goals of this trial closely match developments in Leicestershire. Early reports from pilot areas suggest that partnership working between schools is a key factor in success.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/behaviour/b00204776/taylor-review-of-alternative-provision>

In addition, authorities that have delegated PRU resources to schools have found considerable reductions in demand as schools gain the flexibility to focus resources on preventative action.

24. Leicestershire was recognised for its innovative work in this area on a visit of the House of Commons Education Committee to the County in November 2010<sup>2</sup>. Behaviour Partnerships had been in place covering all county secondary schools since 2005, allowing schools to work together to agree priority cases for additional support, placement in the PRU, and improve in-school support. The impact has been impressive; secondary permanent exclusions have reduced in the county from 120 in 2006-07 to 26 in 2009-10, and have remained at around this level since.

### **The Role of Behaviour Partnerships in Leicestershire**

25. Behaviour Partnerships, voluntary groupings of secondary schools, were established across the county in 2005 in five areas: South Leicestershire, Hinckley and Bosworth, North West Leicestershire, Charnwood and Melton.
26. The Partnerships are attended and led by headteachers, and have enabled schools to work together to plan the use of places in the Pupil Referral Unit, access to support services, and cases needing a managed move from one school to another. They also ensure that the Fair Access Protocol, which ensures vulnerable children are quickly placed when they move schools, operates effectively and equitably across schools and academies.
27. From April 2012, Partnerships received devolved funding of around £800K to enable them to arrange Alternative Provision programmes for young people at Key Stage 4<sup>3</sup>. The devolvement is increasing from September 2013 to cover the management of all secondary Alternative Provision. A Partnership Agreement will set out the arrangements underpinning this devolvement.
28. The work of Behaviour Partnerships continues to develop. By September 2013, central behaviour support services will have closed, as reported to the Cabinet on 8 May 2012, and the functions and resources transferred to schools and Partnerships.
29. The use of secondary PRU places is not evenly spread across Partnership areas. For example one area of Leicestershire has no children currently attending the secondary PRU. Some areas of the county are therefore well on the way of providing for vulnerable and challenging young people locally.
30. New funding arrangements for high needs provision, including alternative provision and special educational needs, were introduced by the DfE from April 2013. The costs of PRU provision need to be fully reflected in per place and individual top up arrangements. Estimates suggest that a single place could cost in excess of £30,000 per year. Schools have indicated

---

<sup>2</sup> Select Committee Report:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmeduc/516/51613.htm>

<sup>3</sup> The value of Alternative Provision in re-engaging students was identified in the Ofsted report on Alternative Provision (2011) <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/alternative-provision>

unwillingness to commission provision from the PRU at this level of cost, were they to become commissioners in the future, which is likely to increase unoccupied and unfunded places.

### **Concerns over the Quality of Provision at Oakfield**

31. Although the Oakfield was judged by Ofsted to require special measures in May 2012, concerns about the quality of provision, for secondary aged children, have existed for some time.
32. In 2010-11, a review of provision for excluded young people led to the merging of previously separate primary and secondary Pupil Referral Units, using the Blaby Hospital site. A new headteacher and staff were appointed, and new classrooms were built to enhance the provision available on the site.
33. The new combined Primary and Secondary facility opened in April 2011, as Oakfield Short Stay School. However, many staff left in autumn term, with the head teacher, to open a new school in the independent sector. A new head teacher was appointed and took up post in January 2012.
34. There have been ongoing difficulties with staff sickness and absence and in the week before Easter 2013, only one secondary teacher was actually available for work. The short term pressures arising from this underlying long term issue led to discussions with a range of providers to make a range of alternative programmes available to KS3 students at the PRU. This commissioned approach to provision for Key Stage 4 has been a successful strategy.
35. The issue of long term staffing retention does not apply to the same degree at Primary, where staffing is more stable, and provision judged to be improving. This enables the consideration of different future options for the primary and secondary elements of provision.
36. A third review of progress under special measures was undertaken by Ofsted on 12 and 13 June 2013. While progress was judged to be adequate in the first two reviews, this latter review concluded that progress was inadequate. The Education (Short Stay Schools) (Closure) Regulations 2010 require that the Local Authority must obtain the consent of the Secretary of State before closure where PRUs are deemed by Ofsted to require special measures. The same regulations also allow the Secretary of State to direct closure, or require the LA to invite bids to make similar provision under sponsored academy arrangements.

### **The Impact of School Funding Reform**

37. The Department for Education (DfE) required Local Authorities to implement a range of school funding reforms in April 2013<sup>4</sup>. This makes changes to the manner in which PRUs and other providers of Alternative Provision are funded

---

<sup>4</sup> School Funding Reform – Arrangements for 2013/14  
<http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/s/school%20funding%20reform%20-%20final%202013-14%20arrangements.pdf>

and the manner in which PRUs are managed through the establishment of delegated budgets.

38. From 2013/14 PRUs are required to be funded under a 'Place –Plus' mechanism. Local authorities are currently responsible for commissioning a set number of places which are required to be funded at £8,000 per place, commissioning arrangements are then in place which establish the local authority as the commissioner for places for permanent exclusions and schools for places for pupils on fixed term exclusions. Through the commissioning arrangement top-up funding is paid for the period of time places are occupied. This creates instability of funding where there are unoccupied places, yet there is a need to retain staffing during such periods.
39. The new long term commissioning arrangements necessary under School Funding Reform have yet to be established although a delegated budget for Oakfield is in place.
40. The Schools Forum at its meeting in February 2013 agreed to local authority proposals to provide transitional funding for Oakfield School in the short term from Dedicated Schools Grant to meet costs arising from the Ofsted action plan and also to provide some short term financial stability whilst Oakfield School moved to a position of a delegated budget. The Schools Forum expressed its concern over value for money and sustainability of the 2013/14 arrangements.
41. Additionally the formula allocation for the expected student numbers at Oakfield is some £200,000 lower than the 2013/14 budget. For 2013/14 therefore additional resources of £380,000 are maintaining the provision.

#### **Leicestershire Vision for Future Provision for Vulnerable and Challenging Children and Young People**

42. Children and Young People who have been permanently excluded from mainstream primary and secondary schools are described as vulnerable and challenging because they are at significant risk of under achievement and missing school, and because they find it difficult to operate within the framework of the timetable and rules typical of a mainstream school.
43. The causes are many but the effects are common: young people who are often angry, resentful, challenging and unhappy. They lack confidence as learners, and often give up at the first sign of difficulty, they may try to undermine teachers or the learning of others to distract attention from their own difficulties, or they may provoke conflict through a heightened and inflexible sense of their own rights or of perceived injustice. They are likely to feel that the education system has little to offer them and they have little chance of success.
44. Provision needs to be made by staff who are robust, resourceful and highly skilled in managing and defusing conflict, rebuilding relationships, re-engaging students after conflict, and encouraging young people to persevere. In the secondary sphere, it is increasingly apparent that curriculum flexibility is also

needed to give staff a wider set of options to try to engage, and re-engage students who have lost motivation, and belief in themselves as learners. There are many examples of where a little success in one curriculum area can spill out across the curriculum as more positive attitudes to learning, and a positive view of the future as a learner. These opportunities need to be related to student interests, subject to regular and rapid review and adjustment, based on a relationship with the young person and their family.

45. Young People who are vulnerable and challenging can achieve with the right support, at GCSE and beyond. Support needs to be graduated in extent (intensity, longevity, flexibility) and proportional to need, where possible, keeping young people in contact with a mainstream institution, and a route to accredited outcomes. The local authority has a responsibility to ensure that every child and young person can access the right support in order to achieve their potential. The current arrangements in Leicestershire are not succeeding and it is important that other options are explored in order to secure good life opportunities for this vulnerable group.

### Options

46. The principles that need to guide the consideration of options are as follows:
- (a) Improved provision for vulnerable and challenging children and young people;
  - (b) Provision of a positive peer group and role models for young people, and more opportunities to return to mainstream schools;
  - (c) Linked provision with the work of Behaviour Partnerships around the county;
  - (d) Partnerships taking greater control of the commissioning of support for vulnerable and challenging young people;
  - (e) Provision is cost effective and sustainable.
47. A series of Options for consultation have been developed through a coherent and robust Options Appraisal. Briefly they are:

#### Option 1:

Close all PRU provision and devolve resources to behaviour partnerships.

This option would enable secondary schools to make more flexible local provision for young people who have been excluded or who may be at risk of permanent exclusion. However, primary pupils are educated full time at the PRU and Primary Behaviour Partnerships are not as well developed as the secondary groupings, although they are keen to innovate.

#### Option 2:

Seek an academy sponsor for the whole of the PRU.

This option would deliver the DfE expectation. However, it would negate the successful work of the Behaviour Partnerships.

Option 3:

Close and devolve to schools key stage 3 PRU provision, and seek academy sponsors for primary provision only.

This option would allow separate development paths for primary and secondary provision, and could potentially provide additional capacity to support improvement work in the Primary PRU. However, this option could leave the primary provision with higher fixed costs because it occupies a site designed for a larger group of young people.

Option 4:

Devolve the costs of and responsibility for key stage 3 provision to Behaviour Partnerships, and look for locality-based solutions for key stage 1 and key stage 2, in the medium term.

This option takes account of the different paces of development of partnership working at primary and secondary. However, it does not provide a quick solution for primary provision.

**Consultation**

48. A 14 week consultation is proposed to consider future arrangements for PRU provision in Leicestershire, commencing on Friday 12 July and closing on Friday 18 October. This will ensure that six weeks of the consultation period falls during the autumn term. The following issues should be addressed:
- (a) Has the merger of primary and secondary provision in September 2011 been successful?
  - (b) Should there be different futures for primary and secondary provision?
  - (c) Can secondary behaviour partnerships take over the functions of the secondary PRU provision?
  - (d) Would an academy sponsor speed the improvement of the provision?
  - (e) How might teaching schools and academy alliances work with the PRU in the future?
  - (f) What is the relationship with the work of the LEEP?
  - (g) What is the most cost effective option that secures the right outcomes of children and young people?

Other Options may be proposed by respondents to the consultation and these will be similarly considered.

49. The consultation will need to seek the views of:
- (a) Staff, pupils, parents, and management committee members of Oakfield;
  - (b) Leicestershire headteachers;
  - (c) Leicestershire parent partnership and parents of children with special educational needs;
  - (d) The Leicestershire community (via the website);
  - (e) Leicestershire County Council departments (property, finance, legal services, etc).

50. The results of the consultation and a recommendation for the way forward will be reported to the Cabinet in November 2013.

### **Conclusion**

51. A consultation will allow the Cabinet to consider future options for the development of provision for vulnerable and challenging children and young people, and build on the GCSE successes that have been achieved with this group in recent years. In the meantime, the PRU will continue to need additional resource and support in order to provide for the needs of children and young people currently placed there and provision has been made for this with the agreement of the Schools Forum. The work of the management committee will be closely monitored and supported by the local authority during this time.

### **Background Papers**

52. Improving Alternative Provision<sup>5</sup> (Department for Education, 2012), Charlie Taylor.

The Importance of Teaching<sup>6</sup> (Department for Education, November 2010) White Paper.

Oakfield Inspection report May 2012<sup>7</sup>.

### **Relevant Impact Assessments**

#### Equal Opportunities Implications

53. Children and young people who are placed in the PRU are vulnerable and fall into the protected characteristics groupings. A formative Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and will be further developed during the consultation activity. The final option recommended to the Cabinet for approval following consultation will be accompanied by a full Equality Impact Assessment and an Equality Improvement Plan, if required.

#### Partnership Working

54. The work of the current Behaviour Partnerships is important to the consideration of the identified options. Similarly, the work of the Leicestershire Educational Excellence Partnership regarding the relationship between school performance and the individual needs of vulnerable children and young people is significant when considering this report.

---

<sup>5</sup> ibid

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/toolsandinitiatives/schoolswhitepaper/b0068570/the-importance-of-teaching>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/inspection-reports/find-inspection-report/provider/ELS/136754>

This page is intentionally left blank