

Appendix B.

Feedback on consultation on the Education Plan for Alternative Provision for JSR.

The consultation was posted on the West Berkshire website. 45 responses have been received of those 13 were either service users or someone who cares for a service user and 28 were non service users. 4 did not state their relationship.

In addition, to ensure that the voice of the child was heard six young people were interviewed and asked 'what has the Reintegration Service and Alternative curriculum done for you'?

The table below gives a breakdown of the responses to the questions and the percentage of support or otherwise for each of the 6 main questions.

	Strongly agree –	Agree –	Neither agree nor disagree –	Disagree –	Strongly disagree –	Don't know –	Total –	Weighted Average –
–								
A network of providers offering alternative provision for vulnerable students Comments (28)	38.71% 12	16.13% 5	12.90% 4	16.13% 5	16.13% 5	0.00% 0	31	2.55
–								
Amalgamate the 2 existing services into a single service Comments (30)	12.50% 4	28.13% 9	9.38% 3	15.63% 5	34.38% 11	0.00% 0	32	3.31
–								
Reduce the number of on-site places for secondary-aged students in the Alternative Education Provision Service (AEPS) to 36 (from 60 in the current schools) Comments (31)	0.00% 0	3.13% 1	6.25% 2	21.88% 7	65.63% 21	3.13% 1	32	4.59
–								
Reduce the number of sites from 6 sites to 4 sites (in the new AEPS) Comments (29)	12.50% 4	18.75% 6	21.88% 7	9.38% 3	31.25% 10	6.25% 2	32	3.47
–								
Reduce the management, staffing and administration costs through efficiencies, by removing duplication and integrating service delivery within the new AEPS Comments (26)	16.67% 5	36.67% 11	10.00% 3	13.33% 4	20.00% 6	3.33% 1	30	2.93
–								
The LA will directly manage the Home Education Service as part of its ongoing statutory functions Comments (26)	19.35% 6	16.13% 5	16.13% 5	9.68% 3	25.81% 8	12.90% 4	31	3.45

The detail for each section is set out below:

Network of providers for Alternative Provision

Responses to this question often focused on mainstream schools and if they could meet the needs of these pupils they did not consider a broader range of providers. However, where alternative providers were considered concerns were expressed that there may not be sufficient providers to meet the needs of vulnerable pupils.

Some responses focused on the Reintegration Service and how it has been able to respond to young people and their needs and the fact that the Reintegration Service has been full to capacity.

As a result of the consultation no specific action or changes were planned to the proposal.

Amalgamate two existing services into a single service

The responses to this question focused on three main areas: firstly, that the two schools provide different services and meet the needs of different groups of pupils and how this would be catered for under the proposed structure. Secondly there was support for the amalgamation of the services though several of the comments came with a caveat which related to pupil places and buildings. Finally there was strong representation from the survey and direct communication from secondary school Headteachers, expressing their concern about the proposed reduction in pupil places.

As a result of the consultation the Education Service will consider the comments and review the number of places.

Reduce the number of on-site places for secondary-aged students in the Alternative Education Provision (AEP) to 36 (from 60 in the current schools)

The majority of the responses to this section cautioned against a reduction in places within the service especially if the service is not involved with brokerage. However, there was a view that it would be better for pupils to stay in mainstream school if they have the facilities and trained staff to meet their needs. Any reduction in places should not result in a reduction to the breadth of support and solutions provided.

As a result of the consultation The Education Service will consider the number of places that the new service offers in the light of the clear view that places should not be reduced.

Reduce the number of sites from 6 sites to 4 sites (in the new AEP)

There is general agreement that the number of sites should be reduced, however there is also some pressure for purpose-built facilities and for the sites chosen for closure to be reconsidered. There are also some comments relating to the reduction of sites leading to the reduction of places. The ability to access the buildings on public transport is seen as a central feature in choosing which buildings to retain.

As a result of the consultation the number of sites will reduce from 6-4, but the actual sites for closure to be further reviewed.

Reduce the management, staffing and administration costs through efficiencies, by removing duplication and integrating service delivery within the new AEP

Many of the respondents believed that reviewing the budget was good and that staffing could be reduced. Several reasons were given: the reduction in students, the reduction of sites and the removal of duplication. However the need for pupil places to be maintained was raised. There was strong pressure for there to be a single site or for some bits of the service to move into a new site. This was seen as reducing duplication. Anxiety was expressed that as two of the Reintegration Service's buildings were proposed for closure and the way the consultation has been structured that the Reintegration Service staff might face redundancy and job loss.

As a result of the consultation and once the new structure has been developed and been consulted on, the service will ensure a fair recruitment process in line with statutory guidance, will be undertaken. This process will be the same for all staff from both branches and will be based on the knowledge and skills of the staff and not where they currently work.

The LA will directly manage the Home Education Service as part of its ongoing statutory functions

Some respondents felt the Home Education Service should remain as part of the new AEP or attached to a school, giving staff who are working in the service greater access to curriculum, resources and training. Moving the service to be managed directly by the Local Authority as an ongoing statutory function was not seen as providing a cost saving or any other significant benefit.

As a result of the consultation Home Education will remain as part of the new Alternative Education Provision service for 2017/18 but may be reviewed again to ensure efficient use of resources and best outcomes for young people.

Other comments and proposals

Suggestions for making significant savings:

The responses in this section focus mostly on the buildings with the recommendation to sell one of the existing buildings and use the money to develop Moorside. One asked why consideration had not been given to the creation of a multi academy trust from the two current services (though the new entity would only be one school).

How might the proposals impact on people?

This section gave respondents the opportunity to express their concern for pupils and staff and the broader community. The reduction in PRU places is seen as likely to be detrimental to young people, their families, mainstream schools and put pressure on community services such as: police, YOT, Fire Service, Community Wardens, PCSO's, Social Services, CAMH's and Health Services.

How can we reduce any possible impact on those affected?

Again this section focuses on the staff, students, mainstream schools and community services. There is advice that the number of places should not be reduced but if the process continues any savings should be redirected to community services and to reinstate some of the services already lost such as Connexions, The Edge and youth services. With a recommendation for closer working between the service, Children's Services and schools with disadvantaged and LAC pupils.

How can your organisation contribute to alleviating the impact?

The YOT and IYSS will continue work with providers and schools to give support and assistance as required and Newbury College which is already registered to work with KS4, will be pleased to work with a partnership of providers. The Secondary Heads will collaborate to make the new system work and support the new Headteacher.

Other suggestions:

One comments, 'why mend something when it is not broken,' and another urges a focus on the young people rather than money and raises the possible impact on the community of young people out of education. There is a proposal to invest in a special school to save expenditure on out of county placements and a recommendation that Moorside should be passed to Thatcham Youth.

Caroline Simmonds 04/11/2016