

Individual Executive Member Decision

Alternative Provision: Joint Strategic Review of Pupil Referral Unit Service

Committee considering report:

Individual Executive Member Decision on 13 July 2016

Portfolio Member:

Councillor Dominic Boeck

Forward Plan Ref:

ID3062

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To seek approval to consult on the Alternative Provision: Education Plan for young people with additional needs, which has emerged from the Joint Strategic Review of the Pupil Referral Unit Service (PRUS).

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To approve the Consultation Document and process.

3. Implications

3.1	Financial:	Alternative Provision is funded from the High Needs DSG funding block. DSG funding is ring fenced, and cannot be used for any other purpose than that set out in the School Finance Regulations. Savings from this proposal will be retained within the high needs block, which will help alleviate the overall funding pressures in this block. The proposal will impact on staffing structures, and redundancy/severance costs could fall on the Council if they were not able to be funded within the current PRUS budgets.
3.2	Policy:	None
3.3	Personnel:	The proposal will result in a reduction in the current service and budget, which will affect staffing structures. The impact of staff numbers/structures will not be determined until after the final design of the new Service is determined in December 2016. The timeline includes the formal processes for staff and Trades Union consultation, and there will be full consideration of role, job descriptions and line management structures as the project develops.
3.4	Legal:	The proposal to rationalise is a lawful one. The LA is responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. Any school that is established and maintained by a local authority to enable it to discharge the above duty is to be known as a pupil referral unit. There is no requirement on LA to discharge

		<p>their duty by setting up a PRU – it can be by other means, for example it could be discharged by schools determining their own provision.</p> <p>There is secondary legislation in the form of Statutory Instruments concerning opening and closure of PRUs which will be followed.</p>
3.5	Risk Management:	Careful planning of the New PRU provision will ensure that vulnerable students are appropriately catered for.
3.6	Property:	The proposals could lead to 2 of the existing PRU buildings no longer being used for that purpose. The Council's Asset Management Group will need to consider whether there are suitable alternative uses within the Council for any of these buildings. No capital receipts are predicted as a consequence of the reorganisation proposal, though vacating Riverside and Moorside may create accommodation opportunities for other services and the communities they are located within. We will retain provision in the East of the District. This could be at Badgers Hill (under lease from the Tilehurst Parish Council) or we could explore alternative accommodation in the East. Assuming the PRU in the East is retained and/or replaced, this remains an unfunded pressure within the Education Capital Programme. The same would apply if there were a decision in the future to consolidate all provision onto a single site.
3.7	Other:	

4. Consultation Responses

Members:	
Leader of Council:	Councillor Roger Croft
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Emma Webster
Ward Members:	All Members
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Mollie Lock
Local Stakeholders:	Initial discussion with staff
Officers Consulted:	Rachael Wardell (Director) Ian Pearson (Head of Education), Cathy Burnham (Service Manager), Claire White (Finance), Gabrielle Esplin and Richard Turner (Capital/Property), Leigh Hogan (Legal) and Abi Witting (HR).
Trade Union:	

5. Other options considered

- 5.1 We considered leaving the PRU Service unchanged, but this was not financially sustainable in the current climate.
- 5.2 We considered passing all of the funding to schools to deliver Alternative Provision themselves, which would have removed the Council-maintained Pupil Referral Unit Service (PRUS), and relied on the use of alternative provision providers from a range of sources. However, we felt this would not provide the best arrangement for West Berkshire students. This was also the view expressed during the pre-consultation exercise with secondary Headteachers in Summer 2015, although not all Headteachers responded. The final proposal encompasses the aspects of the alternative provision service which are important to Headteachers.

6. Introduction/Background

- 6.1 A Joint Strategic Review was established in November 2014 to determine the future of Alternative Provision in West Berkshire. The Joint Strategic Review group includes Councillors, mainstream school representatives, Council Officers, the two Headteachers from the current PRUS and the Chair and Vice Chair of the PRUS Management Committee.
- 6.2 A pre-consultation exercise was undertaken with secondary Headteachers in Summer 2015. Subsequent to this, a formal project timeline was created, taking account of the statutory requirements which apply to making prescribed changes to schools. The implementation date is scheduled for September 2017.
- 6.3 In developing the Consultation Plan, we have built on the good work that our existing PRUS is doing. The PRUS is split into two services, known as the Alternative Curriculum Service and the Reintegration Service. Both are rated "Good" by Ofsted.
- 6.4 Like many councils, we have to make difficult decisions about how we spend money. The Schools Forum plays a key role in determining how alternative provision is funded. We can no longer afford to deliver Alternative Provision in the same way. We have explored how we could deliver education to vulnerable pupils differently.
- 6.5 Following informal consultation with schools in Summer 2015 and discussions with the Joint Strategic Review group, we have finalised the Education Plan for alternative provision for young people with additional needs. We will:
 - Work in partnership with schools, and schools will work in partnership with each other, to integrate education for students with additional needs
 - Ensure there is sufficient provision for those students who cannot attend mainstream school.
 - Secure provision for those students that the Council may become responsible for – either because they are permanently excluded from school or to avoid them being permanently excluded. We will consolidate the current arrangement of 2 schools and 6 sites, into a single Alternative Education Provision Service (AEPS).

- We're committed to enabling every child and young person in West Berkshire to have the best start in life and the AEPS is a key part of our approach to delivering that commitment. The Plan outlines how the proposal will contribute to improving outcomes for young people in some detail. The AEPS will comprise a single school, with a single Headteacher, delivering the service on 4 sites.

6.6 The Plan is built around:

- Extending the delivery of Alternative Provision by working in partnership with schools and building on their strengths and assets. Some vulnerable students will access Alternative Provision at their mainstream school, rather than on an AEPS site.
- Delivering a range of positive outcomes through reshaping the service and working with schools to identify strengths and assets which can be developed to provide local solutions for local children.
- Delivering a financially sustainable model for the future by reducing the proportion of the budget spent on running buildings and reducing management, staffing and administration costs by removing duplication and integrating service delivery.

7. Consultation Document

7.1 The Consultation Document *Alternative Provision for young people with additional needs*:

- Explains the Local Landscape in West Berkshire in relation to vulnerable students
- Identifies the creation of a new Service called Alternative Education Provision Service (AEPS), drawing on the current PRUS, but with a re-designed infrastructure.
- Outlines the current capacity of 84 places (Primary (12), Secondary (60) and Post-16 (12)). The proposed new capacity is 60 places (Primary (12), Secondary (36) and Post-16 (12)). Alternative provision will be enhanced, outside of the work of the AEPS, by the development of new provision within mainstream schools. The aim is to share expertise across the system and to identify the right placements to meet individual pupils' needs.
- Encourages early intervention to reduce the need for alternative provision and plans a flexible, expandable model, which can adapt to the highs and lows of demand, and can offer a variety of provision.
- Reduces the number of sites from 6 to 4, de-commissioning the provision at Riverside Community Centre and Moorside Community Centre. These are 'community' buildings and we will consider the most appropriate use for the buildings going forwards, in discussion with the relevant community.
- Focuses on personalised time-tabling for students, combining on-site and off-site activities. Careful planning of the AEPS provision will ensure that vulnerable students are appropriately catered for.
- Clear accountability of the AEPS to a Management Committee.

- 7.2 Government plans may have an impact over time. The detail of the national position is still emerging. It appears that the government's direction of travel is in line with our future plans. This approach tracks with the government's White Paper, published in March 2016, which explains that, in the future:

We [the Government] will change accountability arrangements so that a pupil's mainstream school will retain accountability for their educational outcomes and will take a lead role in commissioning their provision, including when they have permanently excluded the pupil. As they [schools] will also be responsible for commissioning and accountable for educational outcomes, they will have stronger incentives to take preventative approaches and achieve value for money when identifying the best and most suitable provision for any child that needs it.

- 7.3 The funding mechanisms may change but the overall structure we are planning seems fit for purpose going forward. Relevant background papers are:
- Education Excellence Everywhere – Department for Education, March 2016
 - High Needs Funding Reform – Department for Education, March 2016
 - Schools National Funding Reform – Department for Education, March 2016
- 7.4 The proposed approach will not compromise outcomes for children, particularly the most disadvantaged, as services will be linked to local need, and we will work with schools to identify strengths and assets which can be developed to provide local solutions for local children.

8. Consultation Timeline

Consultation Timescales	Dates
Statutory Consultation (public)	July – October 2016
Statutory Representation period (public)	October – November 2016
Council Decision	January 2017
Formal Consultation with Staff and Trades Unions	January – March 2017
Implementation Plan approved, including any outcomes of competitive appointment process, and formal notice provided to staff	May 2017

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 The AEPS would determine staffing structures / contracts based on what is affordable within their budget, in the same way as other schools do.
- 9.2 The AEPS will determine teaching and learning provision, based on the needs of the student. Flexible provision and Outreach will be tailored to meet the needs of schools.

- 9.3 We have looked at the current levels of income and expenditure and built a cost model for the AEPS. There will be a saving between the cost model for the current PRUS and the proposed AEPS. The savings are delivered by scaling down the size of the Service (from 84 to 60 students, and from 6 to 4 sites); by delivering efficiencies in costs across budget lines, including staffing reductions; and by removing the Council subsidy on the cost of a place.
- 9.4 As a result of being able to reduce charges payable by commissioners (Council or school), and the Council no longer subsidising placements commissioned directly by schools, there will be a saving to the Council's High Needs Block, which will help reduce the pressure in this block. The likely savings are shown in Table 1 below, with further information in Appendix B.

Table 1

SUMMARY OF SAVINGS: Current PRU compared to new AEPS	
Estimated annual expenditure compared to 2015/16 actual will go down by:	£1,138,878
Annual Top Up charge paid by the commissioner of the place (the Council, a school) will go down by:	£4,418
Which is a reduction in the daily rate of:	£23
The estimated saving to the Central Schools High Needs Budget will be:	£819,913
Schools commissioning places may (between them) be expected to pay annually an additional:	£196,086
<i>(there will no longer be a subsidy from the LA)</i>	

- 9.5 The proposal will rationalise our provision whilst ensuring that our statutory responsibilities are met. This will deliver efficiency savings and create a financially sustainable model of provision.

10. Proposals

- 10.1 It is recommended that the Consultation document is approved for public consultation.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 It is recommended that permission to consult is granted.

12. Consultation and Engagement

- 12.1 This report has been commented on by Councillor Dominic Boeck, Rachael Wardell (Communities Director), Ian Pearson (Head of Education), Cathy Burnham (Service Manager), Abi Witting (HR), Claire White (Finance), Rachel Craggs (Equalities) and Leigh Hogan (Legal).

13. Conclusion

- 13.1 Following the public consultation of the proposed changes, the consultation responses will be considered. A final Education Plan for Alternative Provision will be brought forward for formal determination in December 2016.

14. Appendices

- Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment – Stage 1
 - Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment – Stage 2
 - Appendix C - Comparison of Cost, Charges, and Income
 - Appendix D – Consultation Document
-

Background Papers:

1. Education Excellence Everywhere – Department for Education, March 2016
2. High Needs Funding Reform – Department for Education, March 2016
3. Schools National Funding Reform – Department for Education, March 2016

Subject to Call-In:

Yes

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval ☐

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council ☐

Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position ☐

Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months ☐

Item is Urgent Key Decision ☐

Report is to note only ☐

Wards affected: All

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

☒ **MEC – Become an even more effective Council**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority:

☒ **MEC1 – Become an even more effective Council**

Officer details:

Name: Caroline Corcoran

Job Title: Service Manager

Tel No: 01635 519030

E-mail Address: caroline.corcoran@westberks.gov.uk

Appendix A

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

Name of policy, strategy or function:	Alternative Provision for young people with additional needs – Education Plan
Owner of item being assessed:	Caroline Corcoran
Name of assessor:	Caroline Corcoran
Date of assessment:	3/5/16

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	Yes
Strategy	Yes	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes
Function	No	Is changing	Yes
Service	Yes		

1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the policy, strategy function or service and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To re-design alternative provision, maintaining a focus on quality of delivery and the needs of the young person, whilst delivering a financially sustainable model for the future. We are re-shaping the service to meet a complex range of policy, financial and operational challenges, including changes to the funding framework, and to develop a delivery model more able to meet the requirements of schools
Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extending the delivery of Alternative Provision by working in partnership with schools and building on their strengths and assets. Some vulnerable students will access Alternative Provision at their mainstream school, rather than on an AEPS site. 2. Delivering a range of positive outcomes through reshaping the service and working with schools to identify strengths and assets which can be developed to provide local solutions for local children. 3. Delivering a financially sustainable model for the future by reducing the proportion of the budget spent on running buildings and reducing management, staffing and administration costs by removing duplication and integrating service delivery.

Outcomes:	<p>We want to better integrate mainstream schools, special schools and alternative education provision, including PRUs and independent provision, to share expertise across the system and to identify the right placements to meet individual pupils' needs. Some will remain in mainstream school, some will go to special schools and others may be permanently excluded and placed in a PRU or independent alternative provision.</p> <p>We will ensure that there is sufficient provision within West Berkshire for those students who need additional help and support.</p> <p>The Plan will not compromise outcomes for young people, particularly the most disadvantaged, as services will be linked to local need.</p> <p>We will work with schools to identify strengths and assets which can be developed to provide local solutions for local children.</p>
Benefits:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater opportunities for schools to be leaders and partners in the designing and commissioning of alternative provision • A greater focus on preventative work in primary schools and transition work between primary and secondary schools, with access to a wider range of support to address behavioural, social and mental health issues. • A continued emphasis on the importance of mainstream school attendance and reintegration wherever possible • Closer partnership working between schools on behaviour and vulnerability issues, supported by a skilled workforce. • The ability to maintain the important focus on full-time education for students.

2 Note which groups may be affected by the policy, strategy, function or service. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this.

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this
Age	<p>The current PRUS provides alternative provision for primary, secondary and post-16 students. The coverage across the age spectrum is retained in the proposed AEPS</p> <p>Positive Effect</p> <p>The number of places for secondary students is reduced.</p> <p>Potential for negative effect</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council is currently responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age (5-16) resident in West Berkshire.</p>
Disability	<p>The proposal recognises the Council's responsibilities and has specifically retained a guaranteed number of places (Reserved Quota) for Looked After Children or young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and those in other vulnerable groups.</p> <p>The proposal also makes provision for the Council to purchase additional places above the Reserved Quota if needed. In addition, by working with mainstream schools and other providers, the Council could procure alternative provision outside of AEPS if this was the right solution for an individual student.</p> <p>The Council has stated its commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council is currently responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age (5-16) resident in West Berkshire.</p> <p>When a student receives a fixed-term exclusion of more than five days or a permanent exclusion, the school (in the case of fixed-term exclusion) and the local authority (in the case of a</p>

	everything we do. The right setting might be mainstream school, special school or alternative education provision, or a combination of these.	permanent exclusion) must provide alternative education for the student from the sixth day. We provide this more quickly for Looked After Children or young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and those in other vulnerable groups.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender Re-assignment - Marriage and Civil Partnership - Pregnancy and Maternity - Race - Religion and Belief - Sex - Sexual Orientation 	This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.	
Further Comments relating to the item:		
3 Result		
Are there any aspects of the policy, strategy, function or service, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?		Yes
Please provide an explanation for your answer: The focus of the proposal is on considering the individual needs of the student, and creating personalised timetabling and education provision to support their specific needs.		
Will the policy, strategy, function or service have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?		Yes
Please provide an explanation for your answer: The proposal will affect employees in terms of a future staff re-structuring. However, at this stage, we are just beginning the consultation process, and the Plan may change and evolve over time, as it is influenced by feedback. Therefore, there is no direct impact at this point in the process for staff. Before a formal decision on the final Plan is made, there will be a further corporate paper with a revised EIA.		

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template.

4 Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	Yes
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	Caroline Corcoran
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	6/5/2016
Stage Two not required:	

Name: Caroline Corcoran

Date: 3/5/16

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, the Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) for publication on the WBC website.

Appendix B

Equality Impact Assessment Template – Stage Two

Please complete this template if completion of the Stage 1 template has identified that a full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is required.

Before proceeding with this EIA, you should discuss the scope of the analysis with service managers in your area and you will need to refer to the equality impact assessment guidance. A couple of examples of Stage 2 EIAs are provided as an appendix to the guidance.

Name of item being assessed:	Alternative Provision for young people with additional needs – Education Plan
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	
Budget Holder for item being assessed:	
Name of assessor:	Caroline Corcoran
Name of Service & Directorate	Education, Communities
Date of assessment:	06/05/2016
Date Stage 1 EIA completed:	03/05/16

Any actions identified whilst completing this EIA should be recorded in the Action Plan at Step 7.

STEP 1 – Scoping the Equality Impact Assessment

1. What data, research and other evidence or information is available which will be relevant to this Equality Analysis? Please tick all that apply.			
Service Targets		Performance Targets	
User Satisfaction		Service Take-up	x
Workforce Monitoring		Press Coverage	
Complaints & Comments		Census Data	
Information from Trade Union		Community Intelligence	
Previous Equality Impact Analysis		Staff Survey	
Public Consultation		Other (please specify)	
		• Ofsted Inspection	x
		• White Paper	x
		• LCSB Audit	x

<p>2. Please summarise the findings from the available evidence for the areas you have ticked above.</p>
<p>The PRUS is audited by Ofsted and both schools within the PRUS are judged to be Good. The PRUS is well-used by West Berkshire schools.</p> <p>Statutory guidance explains what good alternative provision must look like and the proposals take account of these expectations.</p> <p>The proposals track with the aspirations of the government White Paper - Educational Excellence Everywhere (Department for Education, White Paper, March 2016).</p> <p>In December 2015 West Berkshire LSCB Board conducted a multi-professional audit of school exclusions in West Berkshire occurring during the period September 2015 and December 2015. There was an excellent range of partner agency contributions. The audit recognised the value that alternative provision provided, and also made recommendations on how the service could be further developed to meet the needs of schools and young people. The findings of the audit are in line with the direction of travel outlined in the Alternative Provision Education Plan.</p>
<p>3. If you have identified any gaps in the evidence provided above, please detail what additional research or data is required to fill these gaps? Have you considered commissioning new data or research eg a needs assessment?</p> <p>If 'No' please proceed to Step 2.</p>
<p>In developing the proposals, we also undertook research to look at what other Councils had done in relation to alternative provision. This supported our considerations.</p>

STEP 2 – Involvement and Consultation

<p>1. Please outline below how the findings from the evidence summarised above when broken down, will affect people with the 9 protected characteristics. Where no evidence is available to suggest that there will be an impact on any specific group, please insert the following statement '<i>There is no evidence to indicate that there will be a greater impact on this group than on any other.</i>'</p>	
<p>Target Groups</p>	<p>Describe the type of evidence used, with a brief summary of the responses gained and links to relevant documents</p>
<p>Age – relates to all ages</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council is currently responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age (5-16) resident in West Berkshire.</p>

	<p>The current PRUS provides alternative provision for primary, secondary and post-16 students. The coverage across the age spectrum is retained in the proposed AEPS. Positive Effect</p> <p>The number of places for secondary students is reduced. Potential for a negative effect.</p> <p><u>Actions to mitigate impact</u></p> <p>We are working with schools to develop alternative provision in mainstream school settings, and also considering the use of other providers, where it is appropriate to do so. West Berkshire will have a broader range of provision to meet the varying needs of students.</p>
<p>Disability - applies to a range of people that have a condition (physical or mental) which has a significant and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out 'normal' day-to-day activities. This protection also applies to people that have been diagnosed with a progressive illness such as HIV or cancer.</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council is currently responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age (5-16) resident in West Berkshire. Positive Effect</p> <p>When a student receives a fixed-term exclusion of more than five days or a permanent exclusion, the school (in the case of fixed-term exclusion) and the local authority (in the case of a permanent exclusion) must provide alternative education for the student from the sixth day. We provide this more quickly for Looked After Children or young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and those in other vulnerable groups. Positive Effect</p> <p>The Council's commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do. The right setting might be mainstream school, special school or alternative education provision, or a combination. Positive Statement</p> <p>The number of places for secondary students is reduced. Potential for a negative effect.</p>

	<p><u>Actions to mitigate impact</u></p> <p>The proposal recognises the Council's responsibilities and has specifically retained a guaranteed number of places (Reserved Quota) for Looked After Children or young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and those in other vulnerable groups.</p> <p>The proposal makes provision for the Council to purchase additional places above the Reserved Quota if needed.</p> <p>By working with mainstream schools and other providers, the Council could procure alternative provision outside of AEPS if this was the right solution for an individual student.</p> <p>The proposal recognises the role of secondary headteachers as commissioners of provision from a variety of providers.</p>
<p>Gender reassignment - definition has been expanded to include people who chose to live in the opposite gender to the gender assigned to them at birth by removing the previously legal requirement for them to undergo medical supervision.</p>	<p>This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.</p>
<p>Marriage and Civil partnership –.protects employees who are married or in a civil partnership against discrimination. Single people are not protected.</p>	<p>This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.</p>
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity - protects against discrimination. With regard to employment, the woman is protected during the period of her pregnancy and any statutory maternity leave to which she is entitled. It is also unlawful to discriminate against women breastfeeding in a public place</p>	<p>This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.</p>
<p>Race - includes colour, caste, ethnic / national origin or nationality.</p>	<p>This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.</p>

Religion and Belief - covers any religion, religious or non-religious beliefs. Also includes philosophical belief or non-belief. To be protected, a belief must satisfy various criteria, including that it is a weighty and substantial aspect of human life and behaviour.	This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.
Sex - applies to male or female.	This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.
Sexual Orientation - protects lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and heterosexual people.	This may be a factor for an individual student, and would be covered by the commitment to enable students to learn in the setting that best suits them, making sure the young person is at the centre of everything we do.

2. Who are the main stakeholders (eg service users, staff etc) and what are their requirements?
<p>The main stakeholders are young people aged 5-16 resident in West Berkshire. We also support some post-16 students. There is a clear focus on considering the individual needs of the student, and creating personalised timetabling and education provision to support their specific needs.</p> <p>Staff are another stakeholder group, as are parents/carers.</p>

3. How will this item affect the stakeholders identified above?
<p>Young people aged 5-16 and their parents/carers: The focus on the individual needs of the young person remains. This is not changing. However, the method of delivery a personalised timetable and education provision may change. This could be because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provider is different (the provider could be AEPS, a school, another alternative provider), • the location is different (the location could be within a mainstream school, or on a different AEPS site, or at the location of an alternative provider). • The provision may be different (there are many approaches to support a young person. It is not one size fits all, and different providers may offer different personalised solutions). <p>Staff: The proposal will affect employees in terms of a future staff re-structuring. However, at this stage, we are just beginning the consultation process, and the Plan may change and evolve over time, as it is influenced by feedback. Therefore, there is no direct impact on staff at this point in the process.</p>

STEP 3 – Assessing Impact and Strengthening the Policy

What are the measures you will take to improve access to this item or to mitigate against adverse impact?

Young people aged 5-16: The focus will remain firmly on the needs of the young person, and any change will be evaluated (with remedial action or minor tweaking if necessary) to ensure that the young person's needs are met. Concentrating on personalisation of provision to the specific needs of a young person means that mitigation actions can be taken swiftly to minimise any potential impact that arises.

Staff: Before a formal decision on the final Plan is made, there will be a further corporate paper with a revised EIA and taking full account of the Council's Organisational Change process and procedure. HR advice is being provided throughout the process, with a dedicated HR Manager assigned to support the project.

STEP 4 – Procurement and Partnerships

Is this item due to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors?

Yes

If 'yes', will there be any additional requirements placed on the contractor? Have you done any work already to include equality considerations into the contract? You should set out how you will make sure that any partner you work with complies with equality legislation.

If it is in a young person's best interests for the Council to procure alternative provision from another provider, this would be done under our current procurement rules and would be subject to the Council's legal contract, which include equalities requirements.

STEP 5 – Making a Decision

Summarise your findings and make a clear statement of the recommendation being made as a result of the assessment. This will need to take into account whether the Council will still meet its responsibilities under the Equality Duty.

The focus of the review, and the high-level principles which are the subject of the consultation are fit for purpose and chime with the direction of travel outlined by the government, the statutory requirements and the local expectations of those commissioning the service. The Council will still meet its responsibilities under the Equality Duty if it adopts the principles in the proposal.

A further Stage 2 EqlA will be written and considered when the final design of the future Service has been determined following a significant period of public consultation. This will take account of any equalities concerns which have been raised during the consultation, and any which have been subsequently identified within the Council.

STEP 6 – Monitoring, Evaluating and Reviewing

Before finalising your action plan, you must identify how you will monitor this item following the Equality Impact Assessment and include any changes of proposals you are making.

Once the change has taken place, how will you monitor the impact on the 9 protected characteristics?

At this stage we are consulting on high-level principles, which will underpin the future operational delivery model. A further Stage 2 EqIA will be written and considered when the final design of the future Service has been determined following a significant period of public consultation. This will take account of any equality concerns which have been raised during the consultation, and any which have been subsequently identified within the Council.

STEP 7 – Action Plan

Any actions identified as an outcome of going through Steps 1-6 should be mapped against the headings within the Action Plan. You should also summarise actions taken to mitigate against adverse impact.

	Actions	Target Date	Responsible Person
Involvement & consultation	Internal consultation Statutory Public consultation Statutory Public representation period Corporate decision-making process, including consideration of Consultation Report and findings	May 2016 6 July – 30 September 2016 12 October – 9 November 2016 22 November – 22 December 2016	Caroline Corcoran
Data collection	Consultation Report – see above		Caroline Corcoran
Assessing impact	Consultation Report – see above		Caroline Corcoran
Monitoring, evaluation and reviewing	The proposal will be reviewed in light of responses from the consultations at 3 key points, and the proposals be influenced by/change as a result.	1-11 October 10-21 November By Executive on 22 December	Caroline Corcoran Caroline Corcoran Caroline Corcoran

STEP 8 – Sign Off

The policy, strategy or function has been fully assessed in relation to its potential effects on equality and all relevant concerns have been addressed.

Contributors to the Assessment		
Name: Caroline Corcoran	Job Title: Service Manager (Access, Planning and Trading)	Date: 06/05/2016

Head of Service (sign off)		
Name: Ian Pearson	Job Title: Head of Education	Date: 06/05/2016

Please email a copy of the EIA to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality & Diversity): Rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk

Appendix C

Key: AC: Alternative Curriculum RS: Reintegration Service

Comparison of Cost, Charges & Income					
	CURRENT PRU 2015/16 ACTUAL			NEW PRU (AEPS)	CHANGE
	RS	AC	Total		
No. of Places	36	48	84	60	-24
Cost Per Place	£35,005	£26,907	£30,377	£23,547	-£6,830
Cost Per Place net of Place Funding	£25,005	£16,907	£20,377	£13,547	-£6,830
Annual Top Up Charge Per Place	£19,618	£19,618	£19,618	£15,200	-£4,418
Daily Rate to Charge Per Place	£103	£103	£103	£80	-£23
Total Expenditure	£1,260,169	£1,291,529	£2,551,698	£1,412,820	-£1,138,878
Income:					
Total Place Funding	£360,000	£480,000	£840,000	£600,000	-£240,000
Total Paid by WBC (High Needs Block)	£439,834	£836,079	£1,275,913	£456,000	-£819,913
Total Paid by Schools	£93,714	£75,000	£168,714	£364,800	£196,086
Outreach paid by WBC	£117,000		£117,000		-£117,000
Other Funding received by PRUs	£16,616	£13,681	£30,297		-£30,297
Total Income	£1,027,164	£1,404,760	£2,431,924	£1,420,800	-£1,011,124
In Year Surplus/(Deficit)	-£233,005	£113,231	-£119,774	£7,980	£127,754
Average Number of Places Commissioned	27	46	74	54	
Occupancy	75.5%	96.8%	87.7%	90.0%	