

Equality Impact Assessment Form (Page 1 of 2)

Title of EIA/ DDM: Alternative Provision Model 2016/2017

Name of Author: Michael Wilsher

Department: Education

Service Area: Inclusion and Disabilities

Author (assigned to Covalent): Michael Wilsher

Director: Pat and Sarah Fielding

Strategic Budget EIA Y/N (please underline)

Brief description of proposal / policy / service being assessed:

This report is to consult Schools Forum on the detailed proposals to move to a new model for Alternative Provision for the 2016/17 financial year. This involves the devolution of high needs funding to mainstream schools and academies (referred to as schools in this document) under a service level agreement (SLA) in order to support early intervention and make provision for pupils with challenging behaviour in schools. This would support schools in improving early intervention and support for pupils whilst driving outcomes for pupils and improvement of alternative provision within the city.

Information used to analyse the effects on equality:

To assess the equalities impact, data has been collated regarding exclusions across the city and consultations with all mainstream schools support services. This has been assessed and has revealed the following:

Exclusions

Fixed period (when a pupil is excluded from school for a fixed number of days) and permanent exclusions (excluded and not able to return to that school) from schools in Nottingham City have increased significantly over the last 4 years. The largest increase has been in secondary schools, but the primary schools have also increased in permanent exclusions. The following data shows the increase of exclusions over this period:

| | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | Grand Total |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Primary Fixed Period | 349 | 324 | 304 | 195 | 1172 |
| Primary Permanent | 12 | 21 | 19 | 11 | 63 |
| Secondary Fixed Period | 1804 | 1840 | 2578 | 1383 | 7605 |
| Secondary Permanent | 27 | 73 | 107 | 62 | 269 |
| Total Fixed Period | 2153 | 2164 | 2882 | 1578 | 8777 |
| Total Permanent | 39 | 94 | 126 | 73 | 332 |

Data regarding the number of education days lost to exclusion within the City shows that on average 11% of the school population will lose over a weeks' worth of education from fixed period exclusion. This does not take account of pupils permanently excluded and the impact that this has on pupils, their families or their future educational opportunities.

Nationally, there is a disproportion of the number of students excluded who have special educational needs; also pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds. Nottingham City sees the same picture of distortion locally, with pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds disproportionately being excluded.

The government has released guidance for exclusions as well as exclusion trial which sought to give more flexibility to schools, by giving them the resources and responsibilities for pupils' provision whilst excluded. This has been reinforced with the recent white paper Educational Excellence

Everywhere, which seeks to implement the outcomes of the exclusion trial.

In order to move towards the direction of the exclusion trial, the white paper and follow the example of many other local authorities; Nottingham City local authority have been consulting with primary and secondary schools in the City. This has been with the intention to reduce the need for exclusion and therefore reduce the high number of exclusions seen across the City in recent years. Also because this would become financially unsustainable and would not be the best use of schools or the local authorities funding. The consultations meetings have been an opportunity to discuss a shared way forward. The outcomes of these consultations are:

- Primary and secondary schools agree that there needs to be a change to the current system and that it is unsustainable.
- Funding for the support of pupils should be used earlier to avoid exclusion. This funding could be devolved from the local authorities high needs budget, which is used for the educational costs of pupils excluded.
- There needs to be a robust service level agreement which supports the process and has clear monitoring and responsibilities.

Based on the support of schools and the local authority and considering the exclusion data and national context; It is intended that the proposal to devolve high needs funding to schools is implemented. This will need to be constantly reviewed to ensure effective implementation and monitoring of benefits and in light of the changing national context and potential future changes in law or responsibilities.

| | Could particularly benefit X | May adversely impact X | How different groups could be affected (Summary of impacts) | Details of actions to reduce negative or increase positive impact (or why action isn't possible) |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| People from different ethnic groups. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>By schools providing earlier intervention this could reduce the number of exclusions, which affect all ethnic groups, but could particularly benefit ethnic minority groups as nationally and locally there are disproportionately excluded more than other groups</p> <p>Less exclusion would be beneficial as it would reduce the number of educational days lost to exclusion, increasing the opportunities for pupils in school. This would also support safeguarding vulnerable pupils and local cohesion, as pupils will be able to access support and provision through schools.</p> | <p>Monitor the impact of exclusions on ethnic groups annually to review positive or negative impacts.</p> <p>Monitor the use of exclusions by individual school and share information with schools about increases and decreases to support better inclusion practice and consistent support across all schools.</p> |
| Men | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Women | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Trans | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Disabled people or carers. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Pregnancy/ Maternity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| People of different faiths/ beliefs and those with none. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Lesbian, gay or bisexual people. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Older | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Younger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Other (e.g. marriage/ civil partnership, looked after children, cohesion/ good relations, vulnerable children/ adults). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| <i>Please underline the group(s) /issue more adversely affected</i> | | | | |

or which benefits.

Outcome(s) of equality impact assessment:

- No major change needed •Adjust the policy/proposal •Adverse impact but continue
- Stop and remove the policy/proposal

Arrangements for future monitoring of equality impact of this proposal / policy / service:

This assessment will be reviewed annually to take account if the impact of the policy. Exclusion data will be collected regarding ethnicity, number of students involved in exclusion, the type and length of exclusion, the gender and age groups of pupils as well as reviewing the policy with schools and partners. This will be compared to national data when available.

Approved by (manager signature):

Michael Wilsher

michael.wilsher@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

0115 876 4700

Date sent to equality team for publishing:

11th April 2016

Before you send your EIA to the Equality and Community Relations Team for scrutiny, have you:

1. Read the guidance and good practice EIA's
<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/article/25573/Equality-Impact-Assessment>
2. Clearly summarised your proposal/ policy/ service to be assessed.
3. Hyperlinked to the appropriate documents.
4. Written in clear user friendly language, free from all jargon (spelling out acronyms).
5. Included appropriate data.
6. Consulted the relevant groups or citizens or stated clearly when this is going to happen.
7. Clearly cross referenced your impacts with SMART actions.