

SCHOOLS FORUM – 24th September 2015

Title of paper:	Update on 2015/16 Alternative Provision arrangements and costs
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Pat and Sarah Fielding, Directors of Education
Report author(s) and contact details:	Michael Wilsher, Inclusion Officer
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Kathryn Stevenson, Finance Analyst (Schools) – Resources Alison Weaver, Service Manager – Inclusive Education Service Jon Ludford-Thomas, Senior Solicitor, Legal Services
Summary	
<p>This report is to update Schools Forum on arrangements which have been implemented during 2015 for pupils that have been, or are at risk of being, permanently excluded and to advise Schools Forum of the associated financial implications.</p>	
Recommendation(s):	
1	Note the revised alternative provision arrangements that have been put into place during 2015 as outlined in this report.
2	<p>Note that the additional costs of alternative provision for the 2015/16 financial year compared to the amount budgeted. This cost is currently estimated at between £1.198m and £1.655m as set out in Table 1.</p> <p>This value is currently a forecast and may change dependant primarily on the rates of permanent exclusions) The total over-spend will be funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve with approval to spend being gained through the Council's Executive Board.</p>
3	Note the approach that is being taken to determining the future alternative provision strategy for the City and that Schools Forum will be consulted on the proposed new arrangements in due course.

1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1** The local authority has a statutory obligation to provide education for pupils permanently excluded.

Due to the increased level of permanent exclusions across all key stages, revised arrangements have been required in response to circumstances not envisaged at the time of the original consultation.

This consultation was undertaken with the schools forum sub-group in the autumn and early spring terms regarding Pupil Referral Units (PRU) funding arrangements for 2015/16.

1.2 This report is to make Schools Forum aware of the action taken and the financial impact is set out in section 5.1 of this report.

2. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

2.1 Immediate action has been required in response to circumstances not originally envisaged including, the background to these actions are individually set out below

- Item 2.2 Support for children at Glenbrook (KS1)
- Item 2.3 Expanded student base at Woodlands / Westbury (KS2)
- Item 2.4 Action required in relation to Denewood Learning Centre including the need for significant numbers of KS3 pupils to be educated in external offsite alternative provision (Numbers of permanently excluded pupils at KS3 and 4 significantly exceeding anticipated numbers)
- Item 2.5 Trialling of the Bulwell Hub Pilot
- Item 2.6 Unity Learning Centre (KS4)
- Item 2.7 Longer term arrangements

2.2 Glenbrook (KS1) The Local Authority does not have a learning centre provision for key stage 1 permanent exclusions, as previously, KS1 permanent exclusion have been managed through alternative education providers or swift reintegration back into mainstream school. This has been successful in the past due to very low numbers of permanent exclusions in KS1. However, during the 2014/2015 academic year there was an increase of pupils in Key Stage 1 at risk of permanent exclusion and 5 KS1 pupils were issued with permanent exclusions compared to 1 in 2013/2014. Initially, provision was provided by a specialist educational provider for one pupil, costing on average £15k per term until reintegrated. However, due to the further 4 permanent exclusions an emergency temporary accommodation with provision was required. By providing this in-house there are savings as well as increased stability, support, expertise and monitoring. The temporary accommodation is based at Glenbrook Management Centre and is supported and staffed through the Behaviour Support Team (BST).

In order to accommodate these 3 students with a specialist educational provider, it would cost the authority over £135k to £225k for an academic year. This cost would increase if any further pupils were excluded (min £45k per pupil, per academic year). Therefore, by using this temporary accommodation and provision, we can educate these pupils for under £116k meaning a saving of at least £19k. This also provides a class based provision where pupils interact with other children and has additional expertise and staff from the Behaviour Support Team and monitored through the Local Authority. It also protects against external providers ending provision and delivers a secure and stable provision for pupils. Overall this offers a better value, quality temporary provision than through individual external providers. The provision has the potential to increase the number of students accessing the provision as an intervention, which will increase its value for money. However, this is a temporary accommodated provision pending the outcome of behaviour and provision reviews and their recommendations. The Local Authority does not at this time intend to create a KS1 learning centre, but this emergency accommodation offers a medium term intervention provision to support a small number of pupils at serious risk of permanent exclusion in KS1.

Pupils have been accessing education since April 2015 and are currently receiving 1-1 support and intervention from other specialists. Their complex emotional and social needs are becoming clearer. Consequently, their behaviour is improving and they are making academic progress. A dedicated qualified teacher with behaviour experience has been employed and additional TA's to support students. These pupils are now managing a full-time timetable all week, where previously, some pupils were on limited part-time timetables and struggled to attend. An additional positive has been the opportunity for KS1 Teaching staff and BST staff to share experiences, as well as BST mentors and staff being able to work in a practical teaching environment on a daily basis.

2.3 Woodlands/Westbury Federation (KS2)

The Ofsted inspection of Denewood Learning Centre (December 2014) identified significant concerns about the provision for pupils in Key Stage 2, including the quality of teaching and learning and the behaviour and safety of pupils and staff. The physical capacity of the building to accommodate the increasing numbers of pupils in KS2 was identified as a factor which contributed to the increasingly challenging behaviours.

To address the physical capacity issues immediately following the inspection the decision was taken to find alternative classroom accommodation for a number of pupils

- 6 pupils were identified to continue to receive their education on site within Denewood, taught by Denewood staff
- Woodlands School provided a vacant classroom on a temporary basis to accommodate 4 Denewood pupils, to be taught by Denewood staff, with the support of the experienced KS2 staff and leadership within the school
- Temporary accommodation was installed at Westbury to accommodate 12 pupils. These pupils were to be taught by Denewood staff, supported by staff and leadership and management within Westbury School.

These arrangements have resulted in the following outcomes:

- Attendance of all pupils has increased significantly, so that over the last 2 terms attendance at KS2 has been consistently above 90%
- Behaviour has improved so that across all settings pupils are demonstrating a more positive attitude to learning, incidences of handling are rare and there have been no fixed term exclusions since February
- Teaching and learning has improved, so that there is evidence of progress for pupils across all settings
- A number of pupils are now being prepared for reintegration to mainstream schools

From September 2015, the accommodation in Woodlands will no longer be required due to the reduction in numbers in KS2, as a result of the transition of a number of pupils to KS3 provision.

A total of 26 places will be available for KS2 pupils, 10 places in Denewood and up to 16 places in Westbury. It is envisaged that any spare capacity will be used to assist in early intervention for pupils at risk of permanent exclusion in KS2.

2.4 Denewood Learning Centre (KS3)

Following concerns about the safety of staff and pupils and quality of education provided at Denewood (judged inadequate by Ofsted at its inspection in December 2014) the Education Department temporarily closed this resource and took the decision to relocate our KS2 and KS3 pupils in alternative settings; such as Westbury, Woodlands and alternative providers.

Outline of the measures put into place by the LA to meet the needs of the students on role at Denewood include:

- Clear and exacting Statement of Action published, which is reviewed monthly by PRU management and LA officers concerned
- Head Teacher suspended (a neutral act pending the outcomes of the commissioned investigation)
- Additional management support secured for the acting head/senior leadership capacity at Denewood to include;
 - Temporary appointment of an Acting Head Teacher from within the existing Denewood staff body
 - Support from John Dyson (Executive Head Teacher Westbury Woodlands federation)
 - Recruitment of Assistant Head Teacher from September 2015 to augment management capacity within provision
- Governing Body replaced in its entirety with an IEB
- Full review of health and safety and audit of safeguarding provision conducted. Progress against actions required monitored as part of statement of action review process
- Significant levels of support provided from HR to address outstanding casework and contract issues, support review and implementation of employment related policies, support implementation of appropriate staff structure and recruitment of staff and to support emotional well-being of staff
- Staff training provided re safeguarding, behaviour management/Positive Intervention, teaching and learning, personalisation
- Support for review of all required policies
- Formal monitoring and evaluation of the quality of provision - LA support and training for the acting Head Teacher
- Consultation with NCSEP to quality assure the range of providers currently in use
- Education Welfare support to review policies and practice, promote attendance, implement common attendance protocol, support data analysis
- LA and NCSEP working with PRU staff to improve readiness of pupils and information to schools to promote effective reintegration
- Consultation with HMI and the DfE re academisation / next steps

Outcomes

- Immediate health and safety concerns addressed
- Safeguarding policy and practice compliant with legislative requirements, shared with all staff so consistently implemented
- All pupils have full time provision from September 2015
- Attendance at KS2 consistently above 90% since February 2015, attendance at KS3 improving for those with full time provision
- Consistent implementation of behaviour policy has resulted in reduction of:
 - number of incidents

- use of PI and calming room
- days lost through fixed term exclusions – no exclusions in KS2 since February 2015
- Improved attitudes to learning and more effective teaching evidenced through lesson observation and work scrutiny, particularly at KS2
- Number of pupils now being identified for reintegration
- Required HR policies and processes now in place, reduction in outstanding casework

As of September 2015 Denewood will be educating 56 pupils, of which 30 will be full time at Denewood, 6 at Westbury and 20 at alternative providers. Since January 2015, 6 students have been reintegrated or processing through the reintegration process.

2.5 Bulwell Hub Pilot (KS3)

There has been a growing interest in developing a series of smaller localised AP hubs across the city. As such, an exciting development came in the form of a proposal made by the staff team at Bulwell Academy to pilot a new approach to planning provision for pupils who are permanently excluded/at risk of permanent exclusion. Following significant consultation with Bulwell Academy leaders, a number of pupils currently on roll at Denewood were admitted to the Academy site (as of summer half term break 2015). The academy provides these students with a range of pathways/options depending on individual needs and circumstances. The outcomes of this approach will be incorporated into the commissioned review of existing systems and structures relating to alternative provision / PRU's and outcomes will be fully evaluated mid and end of year.

Pilot arrangements

The pilot provision began 1st June 2015 and is funded for a minimum of 4 terms to August 2016. A clear monitoring and evaluation process has been put in place to assess the outcomes of the pilot and make recommendations for future developments.

The Pupil Referral Unit staff and lead of the Bulwell Academy, jointly identify pupils to be admitted and admission timelines against a comprehensive suite of documentation.

Provision agreed is as follows:

For excluded pupils/pupils at risk of exclusion

- The academy will pilot provision for full time attendance of young people who have been permanently excluded or are at significant risk of permanent exclusion, resident within the City of Nottingham, who have been placed with the academy by the LA in accordance with the agreed admissions criteria and process.
- The young people will remain on the roll of the Pupil Referral Unit. The LA will provide detailed information for admission as required by the academy and will seek to resolve complex placement issues in partnership with the Inclusion lead and Principal.
- When placements are at risk of breakdown the LA and Pupil Referral Unit will work with the academy to resolve issues and seek alternative placements which will then be purchased by the Pupil Referral Unit.

- The academy will pilot 4 pathways of support:

Pathway 1: Reintegration Bridge Pathway

Cohort: Pupils who have been excluded as a result of a one-off incident or whose behaviour presents low level risks. These pupils will be in years 7 or 8 and will have the ability to access GCSE level courses.

Initially 2 pupils will be admitted with numbers in the provision increasing to 5 pupils during 2015-16. One member of staff will run this provision from within the support block in school utilising the provision currently available.

Intended Outcomes:

Pupils will reintegrate to the main academy using the reintegration centre over an extended period. Pupils will have a flexible, personalised timetable with additional study periods for catch up/1:1/agency involvement sessions e.g. CAMHS/BST etc.

Pathway 2: Bridge Nurture Group

Cohort: 4 pupils in year 6 for early admission or in year 7, who have had limited time in education and who have learning needs for which they require additional support to access the curriculum.

The provision will focus on re-engagement of KS2/3 pupils using a Person Centred Review Approach to work with all stakeholders around each pupil.

The nurture group will be supported by 2 adults. Pupils will work in school towards ASDAN/AIM Awards (alternative accreditation to GCSE's) in English and Maths. The provision will include 2 days a week outdoor education, commissioned by the contractor.

Intended Outcomes

By the end of KS3 a decision will be made about the ongoing placement and funding arrangements between the contractor and the LA.

Pathway 3: Social Emotional and Mental Health Provision

Cohort: Focus provision support for full time attendance of up to 6 young people with Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) who have been identified by the excluding school as requiring SEN Support.

1:1 support for each of these pupils will be available, on a personalised timetable which may include a combination of educational options e.g. core curriculum of English, Maths and Science provided in school with pupils accessing Alternative Provision and/or work placements for part of each week if appropriate and funding built in for the Alternative Provision placement.

Intended outcomes:

Personalised, flexible educational programme prepares pupils for next phase of education/training raising aspirations and securing effective transition.

Pathway 4: Alternative Provision (*Not yet funded for 2015-6*)

Cohort: Pupils at KS3/4 who are identified by the LA as requiring Alternative Provision.

Pupils who do not make expected progress in pathways 1, 2 or 3 may also transfer to Alternative Provision.

Alternative Provision will be commissioned by the LA from the academy as part of the solution to a complex placement break down.

The academy will source a high quality education placement enabling core and vocational qualification as appropriate to meet the needs of the pupil and over see this for the rest of the academic year, with a yearly review in partnership with the LA.

Intended Outcomes:

Pupils will achieve vocational qualification and a range of appropriate L1 to GCSE subjects subject to need and engagement.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- The academy will ensure full access to information required by the LA to support the monitoring and evaluation of each pathway.
- This will include baseline information on admission and access to all data tracking pupil attendance and achievement data
- An initial evaluation of the pathways will be conducted by Peter Gray, who will confirm evaluation arrangements with the LA and the contractor
- The LA will conduct minimum termly monitoring visits to the academy to review provision and progress of pupils.

- Quality assurance through regular termly meetings between staff from the contractor and LA officers, as well as using the success specification criteria in Appendix 3.
- Commitment to effective partnership working with the contractor.
- The LA will allocate a budget for the contractor to use for agency support of 32 sessions of Education Psychology Services, and further input from the Behaviour Support Team and Autistic Spectrum Disorder Team as required to support placements and staff in meeting pupils' needs.

2.6 Unity Learning Centre (KS4)

Unity Learning Centre had a total of 104 permanently excluded KS4 students on roll during the 2014/15 academic year; they are commencing the 2015/16 academic year in September 2015 with 97 permanently excluded KS4 students on roll.

A formal framework agreement is currently in place, which was specifically commissioned for Unity KS4 permanently excluded pupils to access alternative provision offsite, and was procured initially (2013/14 academic year) for a projected total of 44 KS4 pupils, all educated offsite, at a full projected DSG cost of £450k. An additional framework agreement was put in place for the 2014/15 academic year for an additional 21 pupils at an additional cost of £250k; this framework only incorporates 7 providers and due to the high numbers of KS4 students permanently excluded over the past 2 academic years, and the very limited facilities at the Forest Road site to educate KS4 students onsite, Unity has had to also broker provision outside of the framework agreement.

Strategic plans are currently underway with regard to the commissioning of an updated framework agreement from 2016; it is planned that this framework agreement will not be specifically for the referral of Unity students but will seek to support wider groups of vulnerable students, both at KS3 and KS4.

2.7 Longer-term arrangements

In order to address the above issues, we established an Alternative Provision Focus Group an AP Focus Group (consisting of Head Teachers / Vice Principals of primary, secondary, special schools (maintained and academies), LA Officers and NCSEP) who have met on 4 occasions and whose role has been to carefully consider and recommend a range of activities to include the Bulwell Hub Pilot / commissioning appropriate reviews / scoping out a possible structure for city wide AP/PRU's.

Whilst our meetings have been engaging and purposeful we recognise the enormity of the challenges we face. However, we will take this opportunity to thank all members of the group who have committed significant time, effort and energy to what is a complex set of circumstances.

The Focus Group are seeking to develop a more effective and sustainable response to pupils presenting challenging behaviour in schools and academies across the city and have;

- commissioned a review of existing systems and structures relating to alternative provision / PRU's.
- commissioned a review of the structure, range of services and systems operating in the provision of education for City pupils with SEN, including special schools and focused provision
- Commissioned a review of the impact of services/agencies that work with our schools and academies KS1-KS4 to improve pupil behaviour/engagement and prevent placement breakdowns beginning with an inter-agency mapping exercise – this in response to the urgent need to put into place provision for KS1/2 pupils excluded or at risk of permanent exclusion.

A fundamental part of each of the reviews has been to interview a broad range of practitioners to help us fully understand the citywide perspective. These conversations have been carried out in strict confidence.

The work has taken place May – September. Authors will endeavour to produce final reports by the start of the Autumn Term. Further time will then be allocated to discuss findings/reports/outcomes with a broad range of stakeholders to assist in the development of new, and preferred, systems, approaches and future arrangements / commissioning processes.

These stakeholders include;

- AP Focus Group
- Primary / secondary (maintained and academy) Head Teachers and Principals.
- LA Officers
- Portfolio holder for Education (Cllr S Webster)
- Schools Forum

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Immediate action has been necessary in response to changing circumstances. Wide ranging options are being considered for the longer-term.

4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES

4.1 These arrangements have been implemented to ensure the LA meets its statutory duty to provide an education to permanently excluded pupils.

5. FINANCE COMMENTS (INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)

5.1 The overall financial implications of this report are set out in **Table 1** below and are forecast at between £1.198m to £1.655m over and above the budgeted allocation.

TABLE 1: Summary of Overall Financial Implications for SSR £m					
	April - Aug	Forecast Sept-March		Full Year Forecast	
		Low	High	Low	High
Glenbrook (KS1)	0.078	0.106	0.130	0.184	0.208
Westbury/Woodlands (KS2)	-	0.000	0.065	0.000	0.065
Denewood (KS2/3)	0.401	0.323	0.550	0.724	0.951
Bulwell Hub (KS3)	0.077	0.075	0.075	0.152	0.152
Unity (KS4)	-	0.138	0.279	0.138	0.279
TOTAL	0.556	0.642	1.099	1.198	1.655

It is assumed that this additional funding will be met from the Statutory School Reserve (SSR). £1.109m was earmarked in the SSR for this risk and was included in the 2014/15 Outturn Report on 18 June 2015.

The uncommitted balance of the SSR as presented in the Outturn Report was £5.747m. **The implication of this report is that the committed balance needs to be increased by £0.546m thereby reducing the uncommitted balance of the reserve to £5.201m.**

It should be noted that there will be significant variability in the costs linked to pupil numbers and the high case estimate could be exceeded, for example if the numbers of permanent exclusions are higher than the same period last year.

5.2 The following sections describe in detail the financial detail of the revised arrangements at each key stage. 5.2 Glenbrook (KS1)

The costs incurred from April to August 2015 in relation to additional arrangements for KS1 pupils are approximately £0.078m. See **Table 2** shows the breakdown.

TABLE 2: Expenditure on KS1 arrangements April-August 2015	
	£m
Specialist external alternative education provision	0.038
Agency Staffing (Glenbrook base)	0.017
Resources	0.001
Taxis (estimate)	0.022
TOTAL	0.078

Three pupils will be educated in the Glenbrook base from September 2015. It will be staffed by one full time teacher and three full time learning mentors. A small non-staff budget is required for learning resources and lunches for pupils eligible for FSM. The estimated budget required for the base for September 2015 to March 2016 is £0.075m. In addition, transport costs for 3 pupils to the end of March would be a further £0.042m, at a cost of £110 per pupil per day. The full estimated cost based on 3 pupils for September to March will be £0.117m. It is anticipated that the base could accommodate a further 2 pupils if required, in which case the overall costs September – March would increase to around £0.145m due to the additional transport costs.

Schools will be asked to contribute the AWPU and any named pupil HLN funding to support the pupil for the period they are educated at the base. Based on the 3 pupils identified for September, this would reduce the cost to the SSR by £0.011m.

5.3 Woodlands/Westbury Federation (KS2)

The costs of the temporary portacabin accommodation at the Westbury site **are not being met by the SSR**. The £0.094m installation cost is being met from a Children & Families Health and Safety contingency within the Capital Programme and the £3,358 monthly rental cost is being met from BSF allocations.

Woodlands and Westbury Schools are charging Denewood Learning Centre £200/day (tbc) in relation to the accommodation of Denewood pupils on their sites. The schools have employed temporary agency staff to support pupils outside of the classroom, and faced additional management pressures.

A proposed KS2 intervention provision would be sited in the second classroom in the new portacabin at Westbury Special School. The cost of the provision for up to 6 pupils has yet to be finalised but it is anticipated that this will be in the region of £0.116m per annum which corresponds to the £19,324 annual cost per pupil envisaged under the original 2015/16 Denewood funding proposals. This would include the cost of a teaching staff and associated administrative support costs, meals and transport. The pro-rata cost for September to March would be around £0.075m. Schools will be asked to contribute the AWPU and any named pupil HLN funding for the period. It is likely that the majority of this cost will be able to be funded from a projected underspend on the Primary Fair Access budget. This budget was underspent by £0.067m last financial year.

5.4 Denewood Learning Centre (KS 2/3)

The costs incurred from April to August 2015 in relation to Denewood pupils exceeded budget by £0.388m.

The budget was based on 72 pupils for the summer term at a cost of £0.583m made up of £0.240m place funding plus £0.343m top-up funding. During this period planned funding was due to be based on £8,000 per place and £11,432 per pupil top-up.

Whilst only around half that number have had their provision delivered by Denewood staff in the summer term, it is anticipated that DLC will have continued to incur costs at the planned level. Additional costs being charged by Westbury and Woodlands, revised transport costs and the cost of an executive head for 1 day per week (£500/day) offset savings in non-salary expenditure arising from the lower pupil numbers. £0.585m top-up funding has been provided for pupils in internal provision for the period April to August. In addition, £0.013m is required to fund the commissioning by the IEB of an independent investigating officer to review and report on the events leading up to the closure of the unit.

The cost of top-up funding for Denewood pupils accessing external alternative provision from April to August has been £0.386m. Funding is provided based on the precise costs that are being charged by each provider for each pupil. Costs range from £55 per day to £340 per day (1 to 1). 2871 pupil days have been provided in external provision at an average cost per day of £134.

It is anticipated Denewood LC will start the academic year with 56 pupils on roll, with 15 of those attending external alternative provision. The cost of provision for the remainder of the financial year will depend upon the rate of exclusions, the capacity of the Denewood Learning Centre to increase the number of pupils in internal provision and the provider mix for the external AP.

Alternative provision costs for the period September 2015 to March 2016 are forecast in the range of £0.300m to £0.500m. The lower estimate assumes that any net increases in pupils on roll from permanent exclusions can be absorbed into the internal provision, with the number of pupils in offsite external AP being static at around 15. The upper estimate assumes that pupil numbers increase in line with exclusions in the 2014/15 academic year and a maximum of 45 pupils are accommodated at the DLC base.

It is assumed that for the remainder of the financial year, DLC will receive top-up funding for internal provision of at least £0.372m, which aligns to the original budget, without regard to the number of pupils in internal provision. However, this may need to be increased to cover internal costs which weren't originally envisaged including additional leadership costs, with a new assistant Headteacher being recruited from September.

5.5 Bulwell Hub Pilot (Key Stage 3)

Table 3 below summarises the agreed funding to be provided to Bulwell Academy for the hub pilot.

TABLE 3: Bulwell Hub Pilot Costs				
Pathway	Costs April – Aug (Start up and provision)	Academic Year Cost	Annual Cost/ Pupil at full occupancy	Costs Sept - March
1	£25,000	£25,000 for up to 5 pupils	£5,000	£14,583
2	£45,000	£75,000 for up to 4 pupils	£18,750	£43,750
3	£6,743	£26,975 per pupil	£26,975	£15,735
TOTAL	£76,743			£74,069

The Pathway 1 cost per pupil represents a significant saving compared to the average cost being paid for external alternative provision (£26 per day compared to £134). The Pathway 2 cost is very close to the original budgeted cost per pupil for Denewood LC. The Pathway 3 cost is based on the cost per pupil for the existing Bulwell Focus Provision for pupils with Autism.

5.6 Unity (Key Stage 4) Top-up funding for Unity Learning Centre for the period April 2015 to August 2015 was £0.172m. The full cost of external alternative provision during this period was £0.342m, which was in line with the budget, but the first £0.174m has been met from Unity's carry forward balance.

It is anticipated Unity LC will start the academic year with 96 pupils on roll. Top-up funding required for September to March will depend on the number of permanent exclusions during that period. If the number of pupils on roll remained static, approximately £0.853m top-up funding would be required, resulting in a full year variance to budget of £0.138m.

If exclusions mirror the pattern for the 2014/15 academic year, £0.994m top-up funding will be required resulting in a full year variance to budget of £0.279m.

It should be noted that without the one-off benefit of the Unity LC carry forward balance, the anticipated full year variance would have been £0.312m to £0.453m. A small proportion of the variance relates to the average daily cost of provision under the framework being higher than budgeted from September (£70/day compared to £61/day budgeted) with the majority being caused by pupil numbers exceeding expectations.

5.7 Longer term arrangements

It is anticipated that the cost of the alternative provision/PRUs review will be met from the current year high needs central AP budget. The cost of the SEN review is being met from the Strategic Alliance budget which was the subject of the Schools Forum paper in April 2015.

5.8

6. **LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT COMMENTS (INCLUDING RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES, AND LEGAL, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS)**

Legal Implications

Since this is a report for noting to update Schools Forum on arrangements which have been implemented during 2015 for pupils that have been, or are at risk of being, permanently excluded and to advise Schools Forum of the associated financial implications, it is advisable that the Schools Forum considers carefully the information and financial implications set out in this report.

7. **HR ISSUES**

8. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)

No

Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached

Due regard should be given to the equality implications identified in the EIA.

9. **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION**

10. **PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT**