

Report of the Cabinet Member for Education

Cabinet – 15 December 2016

PAPER TO EXTENSIVELY OVERHAUL THE ENTIRE EDUCATION OTHER THAN AT SCHOOL (EOTAS) SERVICE IN SWANSEA TO ENSURE FUTURE PROVISION BEST MEETS THE NEEDS OF VULNERABLE YOUNG PEOPLE

Purpose:	To consider the proposed future of Swansea's education other than at school (EOTAS) provision
Policy framework:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Corporate priority• Improving pupil attainment
Reason for decision:	The City and County of Swansea is seeking to extensively overhaul its entire EOTAS Service to ensure future provision best meets the needs of vulnerable young people.
Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parent/Carer/Learner engagement sessions (April 2016)• Visioning workshop involving range of stakeholders and partners (May 2016)• Access to Services• Finance• Legal
Recommendation(s):	It is recommended that: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) the City and County of Swansea extensively overhauls its entire EOTAS service to provide sector-leading practice as recommended by officers;2) Swansea PRU significantly reduces capacity in recognition of increased devolution of funding and responsibility to schools. The needs of the majority of learners with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) are met through mainstream education, with central provision only being made for those learners with the most severe SEBD needs;3) a multi-agency support team is developed to provide support for young people, their schools and their families;4) Swansea's behaviour and wellbeing strategy is overhauled to support the needs of the majority learners with SEBD through mainstream education;5) Swansea PRU is restructured into three strands (including a 'halfway house') educated in fit-for-purpose learning environments;6) permanent senior leadership positions are secured for the Head of Swansea PRU, Deputy Head of PRU and managers for two of the centres and for the support team;7) a new 'early move' protocol is included in an overhaul of the existing 'managed move' protocol;

- 8) additional funding is approved of approximately £100k to carry out a full feasibility study on the Cockett site;
- 9) additional corporate capital funding is approved (subject to a full feasibility study) in relation to the possible accommodation; and
- 10) additional corporate revenue funding is approved (at least for the next ten years) to support additional staff, devolved funding to schools and “managed move” transport costs.

Report Author: Lindsay Harvey

Finance Officer: Pini Patel and Jayne James

Legal Officer: Stephen Holland

Access to Services Officer: Phil Couch

1. Executive summary

1.1 This paper recommends that the City and County of Swansea (CCoS) overhauls its entire EOTAS service to provide sector-leading practice.

1.2 There are four options for a future model of service delivery:

- Option 1 Reduce central support (staff and accommodation)
- Option 2 Maintain current delivery model
- Option 3 Improve current delivery model and invest in current accommodation
- Option 4 Radically overhaul current delivery model and invest in new accommodation

1.3 The anticipated costs associated with each option are summarised in Table 1 (revenue) and Table 2 (capital) below.

Table 1 Anticipated revenue costs

Option	Cost			
	Cost in 2017-2018	Cost in 2018-2019	5-year cost	10-year cost
Option 1	£3.71m	£3.55m	£16.92m	£31.67m
Option 2	£3.81m	£3.81m	£18.76m	£37.81m
Option 3	£4.15m	£3.99m	£18.86m	£35.78m
Option 4	£4.71m	£5.08m	£23m	£44.5m

Table 2 Anticipated capital costs

Option	Cost
Option 1	£0
Option 2	£0
Option 3	£1.5m
Option 4	£6.5m

- 1.4 Option 1 would continue to require substantial revenue costs. This would equate to revenue costs of £3.71m in financial year (FY) 2017-2018, costs of £3.55m in financial year (FY) 2018-2019, over 5 years to £16.92m and over 10 years to £31.67m.
- 1.5 Option 1 would see no capital investment in any site. It would not address serious health and safety concerns which could lead to a forced closure of the Brondeg site before any planned reduction in the capacity in the local authority's central provision. It would not address capital liability concerns at the three sites and is very unlikely to improve academic and wellbeing outcomes. With Option 1, there is a very high risk that Estyn would put the provision back into a statutory category and there would be associated reputational damage to the local authority.
- 1.6 Option 2 would continue to require substantial revenue costs. This would equate to revenue costs of £3.81m in FY2017-2018, costs of £3.81m in FY2018-2019, over 5 years to £18.76m and over 10 years to £37.81m.
- 1.7 Option 2 would have no capital investment in any site. It would not address serious health and safety concerns which could lead to a forced closure of the Brondeg site leaving the local authority requiring emergency accommodation. It would not address capital liability concerns at the three sites and is unlikely to improve academic and wellbeing outcomes. With Option 2, there is a high risk that Estyn would put the provision back into a statutory category and there would be associated reputational damage to the local authority.
- 1.8 Option 3 would continue to require the existing revenue costs and also additional revenue costs to Options 1 and 2. This would equate to revenue costs of £4.15m in FY2017-2018, costs of £3.99m in FY2018-2019, over 5 years to £18.86m and over 10 years to £35.78m.
- 1.9 Option 3 would require capital investment of approximately £1.5m. It would address the most serious health and safety concerns by investing in the Step-Ahead and Arfryn sites. This would improve the accommodation and increase capacity on the two sites, allowing the Brondeg site to close. There would be limited improved academic and wellbeing outcomes. Capital liability concerns though would remain. With Option 3, there is a low risk that Estyn would put the provision back into a statutory category.

- 1.10 Option 4 would continue to require the existing revenue costs and also additional revenue costs to Options 1, 2 and 3. This would equate to revenue costs of £4.71m in FY2017-2018, costs of £5.08m in FY2018-2019, over 5 years to £23m and over 10 years to £44.5m. Officers estimate that the maximum additional revenue required for FY2017-2018 will be in the region of £1.9m.
- 1.11 Option 4 would require capital investment of approximately £6.5m. Option 4 would address health and safety concerns and provide high-quality, fit-for-purpose accommodation on a new site. It would address the most serious health and safety concerns at Brondeg and significantly reduce capital liability concerns. There would be improved academic and wellbeing outcomes. There is high likelihood that Estyn would view this as sector-leading practice.
- 1.12 Option 4 would significantly improve the life chances of children and young people currently accessing EOTAS services by ensuring that the vast majority are educated within mainstream settings. This option would prevent or delay the need for more intensive interventions and would address the concerns raised through pupil and parent voice.
- 1.13 Option 4 would make best use of resources by identifying and realising the efficiencies that can be made by coordinating existing support services (eg duplication and overlaps), and reduce long-term costs on the public purse by providing effective support for these vulnerable learners and their families.
- 1.14 Option 4 would ensure children and young people who still need to be educated in EOTAS settings will be accommodated in a high-quality learning environment, taught by a well-qualified, highly-skilled workforce with support from a multi-agency team to ensure the highest academic and wellbeing outcomes for children, young people and their families.
- 1.15 Notwithstanding the significant budget pressures currently facing the local authority, officers recommend that Option 4 is selected in order that children and young people experience 'the best' provision that is possible.
- 1.16 If we adopt the new model of service delivery, the anticipated benefits are as follows:

An investment of £135k per annum for the new senior leadership team which will provide the following outcomes:

- highly effective leadership of the PRU;
- improved academic and wider outcomes for learners in the PRUs;
- highly effective partnerships with all stakeholders with an increase in the number of learners being educated in mainstream schools; and

- a clear definition of SEBD within City and County of Swansea and an effective strategy to support the wellbeing and behaviour of all learners.

An investment of £195k per annum for the support team which will provide the following outcomes:

- highly effective prevention and early identification processes providing a wrap-around support team for schools and learners enabling an increase in the number of learners being educated in mainstream schools; and
- a team to work with schools, learners and their families to ensure measurable progress.

An investment of £700k per annum, devolved to secondary schools, which will provide the following outcomes:

- improved and more consistent provision across secondary schools better meeting the needs of SEBD learners;
- highly effective partnerships with all stakeholders with an increase in the number of learners being educated in mainstream schools; and
- improved academic and wider outcomes for learners accessing school-based, alternative provision.

An investment of £300k per annum for transport costs to facilitate managed moves which will provide the following outcomes:

- improved and more consistent provision across secondary schools better meeting the needs of SEBD learners giving some learners a fresh start;
- highly effective partnerships with all stakeholders with an increase in the number of learners being educated in mainstream schools; and
- improved academic outcomes for learners accessing a managed move.

An investment of £225k per annum for a new 'halfway house' PRU provision which will provide the following outcomes:

- an increase in the number of learners being educated in mainstream schools; and
- improved academic and wider outcomes for learners accessing the 'half-way house'.

An investment of £6.5m for one-off capital costs for new PRU provision which will provide the following outcomes:

- improved well-being of learners and staff;
- buildings and facilities fit for the 21st century;
- a broader, more effective curriculum; and

- improved academic and wider outcomes for learners in the PRU.

1.17 If we do not adopt the new model of service delivery:

1.17.1 it is likely that the life chances of children and young people accessing EOTAS services in the future will be reduced; and

1.17.2 the long-term costs on the public purse will in all likelihood increase as we will fail to provide effective support for these vulnerable learners and their families. The quantifiable costs of exclusion to the public purse is significant for a permanent exclusion. The lifetime cost calculated is £65k.

1.18 Officers recommend that Option 4 is selected in order that children and young people experience ‘the best’ provision that is possible. A feasibility study will be conducted and will explore possible options for developing the Cockett site. The study will consider the relative merits and costs of remodelling/enhancing existing accommodation by comparison with demolition costs and development of new accommodation. The cost of the survey is estimated to be in the region of £100k and will ensure the most cost effective use of any subsequent wider capital investment.

It is important to note that, in revenue terms, Option 4 will cost, on average, around £650k per year more than the current delivery model and, on average, around £850k per year more than Option 3.

While Option 3 might look attractive on paper, it is important to note that it would not provide the Support Team or “halfway house” functions which are viewed by many stakeholders to be pivotal to the success of EOTAS provision in Swansea.

Similarly, while the estimated capital costs for Option 3 are approximately £1.5m, around £5m less than those estimated for Option 4, it is important to note that Option 3 represents a “make do and mend” model (ie ensuring current accommodation meets health and safety guidelines only).

Paragraphs 7 to 13 (above) provide further information.

2. Introduction

2.1 The City and County of Swansea is seeking to extensively overhaul its entire EOTAS service to ensure future provision not only best meets the needs of vulnerable young people but provides sector leading practice. The objective is to re-configure the service to build on existing good practice, transforming the provision to support vulnerable children and their families and to meet the requirement to provide suitable, full time education, in a timely manner, to those children and young people

needing to be educated other than at school. This must also be seen in the context of emerging national policy, including the recent report from Estyn (June 2016) as well as continuing national and local budget pressures.

- 2.2 The overall objective of this project is to transform EOTAS provision in the City and County of Swansea into sector leading practice, providing a service that has coherence both structurally and operationally and which can meet the diverse needs of children and young people who are at risk of social and educational exclusion. It will seek to ensure that the needs of more learners with SEBD are met through mainstream education, with central provision only being made for those learners with the most severe SEBD needs.
- 2.3 Elected members have previously expressed a desire that EOTAS provision is 'The Best'. The current provision is far from such a description.
- 2.4 Two of the three buildings currently used are not fit for purpose and the other building lacks facilities. The Brondeg House site, which currently houses the Key Stage 4 Education Centre and EOTAS Pathways is unsuitable and externally is in a very poor state of repair.
- 2.5 The Step-Ahead site is cramped and has inadequate welfare facilities for both staff and pupils. There are an inadequate number of classrooms and both internal and external facilities for pupils' recreation with limited capacity to address this given the footprint of the building.
- 2.6 The Arfryn site requires improvement in order for pupils' therapeutic needs and recreational facilities to be met.
- 2.7 Poverty and social disadvantage increase the risks of being excluded from school, exacerbating the achievement gap. One in 20 secondary students will experience at least one fixed-term exclusion each year. Two-thirds of fixed period exclusions in secondary schools were given to pupils who had already received at least one exclusion earlier in the year.
- 2.8 Most schools are hugely committed to avoiding the use of exclusions but in some instances, exclusion may be the only appropriate response to severe discipline problems.
- 2.9 The quantifiable costs of exclusion to the public purse and to the individual are great though hard to quantify (eg one estimate of the lifetime cost to the individual and the public purse has been calculated at £65k). A place in a PRU for an excluded learner is calculated by the UK Government to cost £15k per year. The average cost for a secondary school place is £4k per year. The City and County of Swansea PRU has an average cost per pupil of approximately £14k to £16k per year.

- 2.10 On 24 May 2016, the City and County of Swansea held a workshop, involving a wide range of delivery partners and stakeholders, to consider how the local authority could best support the needs of vulnerable learners in Swansea going forward. See appendix A for further details and further background information on recent PRU provision in Swansea.
- 2.11 In developing the proposals, it has been important to ensure that the principles of co-production have been recognised and will continue to be implemented as the project moves forward. The City and County of Swansea is committed to involving parents, carers and young people, who use the service, as equal partners, recognising that they have the ability to address real issues that they themselves face and can therefore contribute effectively to the design of the service.

3. Summary of the changes proposed

- 3.1 The needs of the majority learners with SEBD are met through mainstream education, with central provision only being made for those learners with the most severe SEBD needs.
- 3.2 Swansea PRU is restructured into three strands educated in new, fit-for-purpose learning environments. The aim whenever possible is for those learners accessing the central provision return to a mainstream school. We will do this by giving learners the opportunity for a new beginning, the inspiration to build new skills and to improve behaviour giving them the confidence and the foundations for new achievements and to increase their life chances.
- 3.3 PRU A will comprise: a nurture provision for young people with significant mental health difficulties (which will encompass the provision currently available through the Step-Ahead Centre).
- 3.4 PRU B will comprise: a provision for young people with SEBD (which will encompass the provision currently available through the Key Stage 4 Education Centre, Arfryn and EOTAS Pathways).
- 3.5 PRU C will comprise: a “halfway house” setting which will support the rapid reintegration of temporarily excluded pupils back into schools and support the management for early/managed moves. The premises of PRU C will also host the Behaviour Support Team and Home Tuition Team.
- 3.6 The additional early intervention and prevention strand of the enhanced graduated response should be developed and strengthened to build capacity in both mainstream and EOTAS settings.
- 3.7 The enriched early intervention and prevention strand should strengthen services that already exist within the City and County of Swansea, and where necessary realign them, to support the prevention /wellbeing of vulnerable children and families at a time of identified need.

- 3.8 Permanent senior leadership positions are secured for the Head of Swansea PRU, Deputy Head of PRU and managers for two of the centres and for the support teams.
- 3.9 A new 'early move' protocol is included in an overhaul of the existing 'managed move' protocol.
- 3.10 The behaviour and wellbeing strategy for Swansea is overhauled to further support schools to manage SEBD.

4. Further information on the proposed changes

- 4.1 The prevention and early intervention strand will effectively form a wrap-around support team for schools which would have the role of providing support for young people, their schools and their families with a focus on developing long-term strategies for those children and young people most at risk of needing EOTAS services. Interventions should help support schools with strategies to enable them to be able to keep these children and young people in a mainstream setting.
- 4.2 The lead worker is someone who takes the lead to co-ordinate provision and be a single point of contact for a child and their family, when a range of services are involved with that child or family and an integrated response is required. For schools, brokerage of this function will mean that they have already exhausted all of the interventions accessible to them via their graduated response. The lead work approach will:
 - 4.2.1 Act as a single point of contact for the child or family, who they can trust and who can engage them in making choices, navigating their way through the system and effecting change.
 - 4.2.2 Co-ordinate the delivery of the actions agreed by the practitioners involved, to ensure that children and families receive an effective service which is regularly reviewed. These actions will be based on the outcome of the assessment and recorded in a plan.
 - 4.2.3 Reduce overlap and inconsistency in the services received.
- 4.3 Key to the success of the lead work approach are a number of factors:
 - 4.3.1 Build a trusting relationship with the child and family (or other carers).
 - 4.3.2 Be a single point of contact for the family and a sounding board for them to ask questions and discuss concerns.
 - 4.3.3 Co-ordinate the effective delivery of an agreed set of actions utilising a Team Around the Family and Signs of Safety approach.
 - 4.3.4 Identify where additional services may need to be involved and put processes in place for brokering their involvement.
 - 4.3.5 Be the single point of contact for all practitioners who are delivering services to the child.

- 4.3.6 Continue to support the child or family if more specialist assessments need to be carried out.
- 4.3.7 Support the child through key transition points.
- 4.4 The potential outcomes of the approach are:
 - 4.4.1 improved wellbeing for the young person and all of the family;
 - 4.4.2 improved attendance for the young person; and
 - 4.4.3 reduction in demand for high-end intervention including social services and EOTAS provision.
- 4.5 The halfway house, PRU A and PRU B would work with different types of young person as described by the case studies below

Case Study 1 – PRU C (halfway house)

The first type of young person that would be referred to the halfway house would be one who is at school action plus of the graduated response, has had input from services such as the educational psychologist, the behaviour support team and had extended support from the lead worker team. The young person would not have responded to this support and would be still presenting with behaviour that was difficult for school to manage. All professionals working with the young person would consider that a half term placement in the halfway house would be of benefit as it would enable the young person to spend a block of time away from the mainstream school. This would enable a period of assessment and continued support from the lead worker, educational psychologist, behaviour support teacher and halfway house staff to take place. During this period, contact would be maintained with the mainstream school so that they can plan effectively for a return to school to take place after the half-term's placement at the halfway house. This would take place if all professionals agree that sufficient progress has been made by the young person to be able to re-integrate. Should insufficient progress have been made, then a referral would be made to the EOTAS panel for consideration of another half-term's placement at the halfway house or a move to PRU B for a defined period.

Case Study 2 - PRU C (halfway house)

The second type of young person that would be referred to the halfway house would be one who presents with episodes of challenging behaviour having not previously have exhibited such behaviour. Again, the placement in the halfway house would be of benefit as it would enable the young person to spend a block of time away from the mainstream school. This would enable a period of assessment and support from the lead worker, educational psychologist, behaviour support teacher and halfway house staff to take place. The aim would be to reintegrate the young person to mainstream school after a half-term's placement in the halfway house.

Case Study 3 – PRU A

A young person requiring provision at PRU A would usually have been presenting as having difficulties over an extended period in mainstream. This type of young person would be at school action plus of the graduated response and would have had input from the educational psychologist, the behaviour support teacher and is very likely to have been accessing support from the Education Welfare Service (EWS) and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). The young person would have been supported by the lead worker team and despite all this input, have been unable to be able to access mainstream provision due to acute anxiety and/or mental health difficulty. All professionals would have agreed that a placement at PRU A would be beneficial for either a fixed term period (for young people of key stage 3 age) with a subsequent attempt at reintegration to mainstream school or for a longer period (for young people of key stage 4 age).

Case Study 4 – PRU B

The first type of young person requiring provision at PRU B would be one who is at school action plus of the graduated response, has had input from services such as the educational psychologist, the behaviour support team and had long-term support from the lead worker team. The young person would not have responded to this support and would be still presenting with very challenging behaviour that was extremely difficult for school to manage. School would have used their devolved money to give a high level of support to the young person and would have exhausted all of their alternative on-site options. All professionals would have agreed that a placement at PRU B would be beneficial for either a fixed term period (for young people of key stage 3 age) with reintegration continuing on a limited basis and with a subsequent attempt at full reintegration to mainstream school. Young people of key stage 4 age would not be expected to maintain reintegration to their mainstream school.

Case Study 5 – PRU B

The second type of young person requiring PRU B provision would be one where there has been a recent episode of extremely challenging behaviour such as a serious assault, a drug related offence or an offence of a sexual nature. The episode would have been deemed as serious enough for the mainstream school to either issue a permanent exclusion or to seek PRU B placement in order to avoid a PRU B placement. The young person would access the lead worker team at PRU B.

- 4.6 To facilitate this, mainstream secondary schools will receive £408k in financial year 2016-2017 and £700k from the financial year 2017-2018, devolved using a formula agreed with headteachers so that each school has additional funding to support prevention and early intervention. There is a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between City and County of

Swansea and all secondary schools which requires the use of the devolved funding to supplement provision to retain as many of these learners in the mainstream setting as possible, thus reducing the requirement for EOTAS provision.

- 4.7 These teams would work with schools, pupils and their families within prescribed intervention periods where key milestones will be established to determine measurable progression. Referrals will come directly through schools or via a step up/step down process with social workers in the statutory intervention section. If it is felt that extra intervention is required and/or behaviour/learning barriers are escalating, the support team would be likely to refer the case to the 'halfway house' provision or refer to the Managed Move or Additional Learning Needs (ALN) or EOTAS Panel.
- 4.8 Resource identified within the prevention and early intervention teams will be aligned to schools based on the identified demand within each individual school and giving consideration to the demand within in-area social work teams.
- 4.9 Single-issue support will be brokered via an individual brokerage process for each service. However, agreement for lead work support will be agreed via a single brokerage/referral process which will continue to build on the development of a model of multi-agency brokerage in schools. This model will be proportionate to the levels of demand in each school. It will be supported by the development of an enhanced Vulnerability Assessment Profile (VAP) data set, which will enable all stages of the graduated response to be captured and tracked.
- 4.10 Governance of the resource alignment, brokerage arrangements and performance monitoring would ultimately sit with the EOTAS Project Board with specific tasks delegated to specific sub groups and leadership roles within the structure.
- 4.11 A clearer definition of SEBD within the City and County of Swansea will be needed as part of a new local authority behaviour and wellbeing strategy which will need to be developed. A transparent protocol for managing learners with SEBD is required that takes into account the graduated response for provision. This protocol should be drawn up by local authority officers, headteachers and professionals in partner agencies and will need to give clarity to the expectations of all stakeholders for the degree of SEBD that mainstream schools will be expected to manage. This protocol will also help ensure that the numbers of learners with SEBD being referred for central provision will be reduced in the future. It will be based on a continuum of need model making reference to Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) tiers of transition and VAP indicators. It will be important to establish consistency of definition and a commonly understood language for all stakeholders, service users and providers.

5. Provision

- 5.1 New protocols should be drawn up for 'early move' through the 'managed move' protocol for children and young people still in schools to remain in mainstream education through a move to an alternative school. This will need to be supported by additional funding to facilitate transport costs for children and young people across Swansea and a more collegiate approach to "managed moves" from headteachers. Officers anticipate that the additional costs to facilitate transport for these moves, as outlined above, will be in the region of £300k per annum.
- 5.2 The additional funding will be devolved to secondary schools to run their own learner-support programmes and to further reduce the number of learners in need of EOTAS provision. Building on the self-improving school model the system will be challenged and supported to share best practice. It will be necessary to ensure that mainstream secondary schools have sufficient time to extend existing provision and for schools and the local authority to evaluate their provision for 14 to 16-year-old learners with SEBD.
- 5.3 Alternative and much improved physical settings need to be made available to ensure children and young people with SEBD and those with mental health/anxiety issues are educated in fit-for-purpose learning environments.
- 5.4 A new centrally-funded 'halfway-house' provision should be created enabling up to 14 learners who are most at risk of requiring EOTAS services to have a period of one half term's assessment and support out of school. There would be continuity of lead worker and the Support Team would continue to be heavily involved, along with the mainstream school, to ensure a quick turn-around for the learner and a successful full-time reintegration after a half term into mainstream education.
- 5.5 Swansea PRU significantly reduces capacity for learners with SEBD from 131 to 77 over a five-year period with provision only being made for those learners with the most severe SEBD needs as defined by the new working protocol.
- 5.6 Swansea PRU initially increases capacity for learners with significant mental health difficulties from 28 to 35 and over a five-year period as capacity in mainstream schools. The new model of service delivery would then reduce to 21 as defined by the new working protocol.
- 5.7 Over a five-year period with provision and capacity as mainstream schools builds the total PRU provision (A, B, and C) will reduce to 98 places.
- 5.8 The focus at all centres should be on high-quality training and development for staff, an exciting and relevant curriculum, therapeutic counselling and excellent leadership. This will be clearly linked to the

priorities of the PRU's Improvement Plan. A structured, costed and evaluated training programme based on current high-quality practice with proven impact will be introduced.

5.9 We would seek to draw upon the success of the Everton Free School model in leveraging the potential benefits linking with local large organisations. In order to do this, the model needs to develop a closer working partnership with Swansea City Football Club, Ospreys Rugby, local businesses and the universities to raise aspirations for our most vulnerable learners.

5.10 EOTAS services in Swansea (including the PRU) will be rebranded recognising the importance of learner voice and Welsh culture.

Table 3 EOTAS Provision and caseload 2016-2021

Provision	Number on roll 2016-2017	Number on roll 2017-2018	Number on roll 2018-2019	Number on roll 2019-2020	Number on roll 2020-2021	Rationale
Step-Ahead (Future PRU A)	28	35	35	28	21	Increasing demand for service but as capacity builds reduces again
Arfryn (Part of future PRU B)	56	49	42	35	28	Reduction in provision to take account of reduction of key stage 4 aged SEBD places
Key Stage 4 Education Centre (Part of future PRU B)	14	14	14	12	10	Reduction as more pupils retained in mainstream education
EOTAS Pathways (Part of future PRU B)	61	56	51	38	25	Reduction as more pupils retained in mainstream education
Halfway house	-	14	14	14	14	Small caseload to ensure sufficient

						support available
Total PRU provision	159	168	156	127	98	Initial increase in Year 1 and reduction of 61 places by 2020

6. Staffing

- 6.1 The appointment of a highly-effective senior leader to manage the Swansea PRU is seen as a critical step in ensuring sector-leading practice is secured. With this in mind, it is recommended that we move at pace with the recruitment of a permanent Head of Swansea PRU and that the salary for this post is positioned at the upper end of the (School) Leadership Pay Range (ie L35 or c. £89k).
- 6.2 Permanent senior leadership positions are secured for Deputy Head of PRU and managers for two of the centres and for the support teams. The line management of support for the small minority of pregnant youngsters and young mothers who cannot access mainstream education, should fall under the management of the Deputy Head of PRU (see Appendix B).
- 6.3 Provision at the Arfryn Education Centre is reduced. This restructuring process would lead to a reduction of up to eight full-time equivalent (FTE) staff with every effort being made to ensure wherever possible that compulsory redundancy is avoided.
- 6.4 The centrally-coordinated provision for 14 to 16-year-old learners with SEBD is reduced and will be served by a central team of around 14 FTE staff (as opposed to the current complement of 26 FTE staff). This restructuring process would lead to a reduction of up to 12 FTE staff with every effort being made to ensure wherever possible that compulsory redundancy is avoided.

7. Location

- 7.1 The accommodation requirements for the PRU have been revised in view of the proposed new model and in consideration of Building Bulletin guidance.
- 7.2 A review of the local authority's available assets has been undertaken and enquiries also made of ABMUHB and Gower College to establish if they have any buildings that could be suitable (see Appendix C).
- 7.3 Subject to a feasibility study being undertaken, at this stage, the Cockett House site for the whole PRU presents the optimum solution, and releases the three existing sites. The use of only part of this site for the PRU would not achieve the same benefits, but significantly compromise

the value and saleability of the remainder. It is therefore recommended that this option is explored further.

- 7.4 The feasibility study would also need to consider suitability, life expectancy, opportunity cost, impact on backlog maintenance and revenue running costs, including NNDR/rates costs.
- 7.5 Until the outcome of the feasibility study is known it is not possible to provide a robust estimate of the capital costs which may be required. It would also not be possible for the accommodation improvements applicable to options 3 and 4 to be delivered by September 2017. It would therefore be necessary to plan for an interim measure, to provide accommodation for PRU C from September 2017. This would not prevent the new model of service provision commencing in September 2017, with the full benefits of the new accommodation being realised at the earliest opportunity subsequently.

8. Risks and issues

- 8.1 A detailed risk register is attached at Appendix D.

9. Financial

Costs

- 9.1 A considerable amount of further officer work is required, including a feasibility study, to evaluate the most appropriate accommodation solution and design, and to cost any necessary enhancements and modifications to accommodation and facilities. Even with the provision of the necessary feasibility budget, officer capacity, and the required capital investment to deliver the resulting accommodation changes, the accommodation improvements could not be completed by the summer of 2017. This does not prevent the launch of the new service model from September 2017; however, it may be necessary for a transitional accommodation strategy until the full capital works necessary can be completed.

Benefits

- 9.2 The EOTAS review is a key element within a wider coherent medium-term financial strategy, approved within the council budget, to continue to prioritise the delegated schools budget, to optimise the level of delegation of funding and responsibilities to schools, and to continue to enhance the capacity within mainstream schools to meet the educational needs of all pupils, so minimising the need to place pupils within independent of other authority provision. It is also part of a wider cross cutting strategy which seeks to deliver broader service and financial benefits across other council services and indeed other agencies.

- 9.3 Consequently, the EOTAS review is part of a broader series of service reviews which seek to deliver longer term financial benefits for the authority, including the review of specialist teaching facilities and the special schools review. Significant investment (both revenue and capital) is required up front across all these areas and particularly the special schools review which most directly impacts on the number of pupils that will need to be placed outside of Swansea provision, in expensive independent and other authority provision, in future years.
- 9.4 Therefore, this broader educational strategy seeks to invest up front in order to more effectively manage further costs falling on the council in the future, rather than to deliver savings against current approved base budgets within education. This is particularly the case in respect of the EOTAS review where significant savings targets amounting to £340k have already been reflected in the 2016-2017 approved base budgets on the basis of a previously proposed model of provision.
- 9.5 The model of provision proposed within this report has been refined, and indeed enhanced, in the light of wider stakeholder engagement and requires additional funding (both revenue and capital) up front, rather than delivering the required medium-term financial plan savings targets. Over the longer term, as the strategy benefits are realised, it may be possible to 'recoup' some of this additional up front revenue funding but it is very unlikely that the original savings targets required and reflected in base 2016-2017 budgets will be deliverable. It is certainly undeliverable to deliver these savings targets as well as the additional devolution of funding to schools.
- 9.6 The proposed model requires the enhancement of mainstream capacity within schools through the delegation of additional funding, on the assumption that this will allow a phased reduction in the EOTAS provision that is required. This requires schools to honour the commitments set out in the agreed Memorandum of Understanding as part of rigorous panel processes. Should demands on EOTAS provision continue at a higher level it will be necessary to retrospectively clawback any additional costs from the overall delegated secondary schools budget in the following year.
- 9.7 Projected costs over five and ten years for the proposed model are shown in the table below:

	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	first 5 years	Next 5 years	Over 10 years
Option 1 - October 15								
Cost of provision (base budget of £2.77m)	2.770	2.670	2.510	2.150	1.910	12.010	9.550	21.560
Unachievable savings target	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	1.700	1.700	3.400
Devolved funding	0.408	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700	3.208	3.500	6.708
Total unavoidable costs	3.518	3.710	3.550	3.190	2.950	16.918	14.750	31.668
Base Budget Shortfall	-0.748	-0.940	-0.780	-0.420	-0.180	-3.068	-0.900	-3.968
Option 2 - Current Provision								
Current approved base budget	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	13.850	13.850	27.700
Unachievable savings targets	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	1.700	1.700	3.400
Devolved funding	0.408	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700	3.208	3.500	6.708
Total unavoidable costs	3.518	3.810	3.810	3.810	3.810	18.758	19.050	37.808
Base Budget Shortfall	-0.748	-1.040	-1.040	-1.040	-1.040	-4.908	-5.200	-10.108
Option 3 - minimum approach								
cost of provision	2.770	2.670	2.510	2.150	1.910	12.010	9.550	21.560
Unachievable savings target	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	1.700	1.700	3.400
Devolved funding	0.408	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700	3.208	3.500	6.708
Transport Costs	0.175	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.375	1.500	2.875
Head of PRU - enhanced role	0.023	0.135	0.135	0.135	0.135	0.563	0.675	1.238
Total Cost of Provision	3.716	4.145	3.985	3.625	3.385	18.856	16.925	35.781
Total Base Budget	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	13.850	13.850	27.700
Base Budget Shortfall	-0.946	-1.375	-1.215	-0.855	-0.615	-5.006	-3.075	-8.081
Option 4 - Enhanced Model								
Cost of provision	2.770	3.020	3.210	3.060	2.700	14.760	12.150	26.910
Unachievable savings target	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	0.340	1.700	1.700	3.400
Devolved funding	0.408	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700	3.208	3.500	6.708
Transport Costs	0.175	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.375	1.500	2.875
Halfway House	0.000	0.125	0.225	0.225	0.225	0.800	1.125	1.925
Head of PRU - enhanced role	0.023	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.463	0.550	1.013
Support Team	0.000	0.115	0.195	0.195	0.195	0.700	0.975	1.675
Total Cost of Provision	3.716	4.710	5.080	4.930	4.570	23.006	21.500	44.506
Total Base Budget	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	2.770	13.850	13.850	27.700
Base Budget Shortfall	-0.946	-1.940	-2.310	-2.160	-1.800	-9.156	-7.650	-16.806

9.8 The revenue costs for the current model for 2016-2017 are £3.518m but only £2.77m is funded within the approved base budget. Given that transport costs for managed move, devolved funds for mainstream schools, remedial work required at Brondeg House and Step-Ahead and current savings targets of £340k need also to be taken into account, there will be a significant shortfall against the budget provision whether or not the current model continues or a new model is implemented.

9.9 It is not possible to deliver both the challenging savings targets required as well as devolving significant funding to schools and it may not be possible to achieve either.

9.10 Calculations are based on the following assumptions:

9.10.1 Minimum statutory staffing ratios are kept at all times.

9.10.2 £340k savings expected in 2016-2017 will not be achieved (neither will this target be achieved in subsequent years if the new service delivery model is chosen).

9.10.3 The support worker team will work in PRUs A, B and C for the new service delivery model.

9.10.4 Mainstream secondary schools continue to get £700k per annum devolved over the five-year period.

9.10.5 It is not possible at the moment to provide any estimate of redundancy costs.

9.10.6 Transport costs (estimated to be £300k per annum) for the early/managed move process are included in the costs for the new service delivery model.

Table 5 Non-financial benefits

Benefit Description	Baseline Measure	Target Measure	Estimated period of realisation	Notes
Increased number of children and young people remain in mainstream provision	Current PRU caseload 159	Future PRU caseload 98	4 years	61 more pupils will be retained in mainstream schools
Improved pupil achievement and attainment.	Pupil achievement and attainment for SEBD pupils is lower than can be expected	PRU performance 2016-17 key stage 2 CSI L1 – L2 – L2+ -	2 years	Performance indicators will include core subject indicators, Level 1, Level 2 and Level 2+ thresholds (based on individual pupil estimates) and soft (wellbeing) outcomes.
Improvement in attendance levels and days of education lost	PRU attendance 2015-16 – 65%	PRU attendance 2016-17 82%	1 year	Aspirational target
New provision will address the views of children, young people	Learners and their families are currently	New provision will lead to improved	2 years	

and their families	dissatisfied with accommodation	satisfaction and attitude towards placement		
All pupils provided with suitable education within 15 days of a panel decision being made that they should receive EOTAS	Approximately 50% currently	100% of pupils receive suitable placement	1 year	Would depend on availability of places. Synergy between panels and streamlined panel processes would be required
Improved curriculum continuity for pupils in EOTAS and increase in personalised programmes for individual pupils at risk of poor outcomes	Little involvement of mainstream schools in provision for post-14 SEBD learners and pupils with anxiety and mental health difficulties. Little curriculum continuity	New behaviour strategy to provide linkage between mainstream and EOTAS for wellbeing curriculum and individualised curricula	3 years	Timescale dependent on introduction of new behaviour strategy
Improved accessibility to specialist agencies for pupils who receive EOTAS	Inconsistent access to services often dependent on mainstream school provision and support	All EOTAS pupils to have support along the new graduated response	1 year	Pupil and parent voice will be addressed
Increase in support work with	Support work is	Ensure consistency	1 year	Resource dependent target

families of most vulnerable children and young people	currently inconsistent	y and access to support for all of the most vulnerable children and young people		
Improvement in information sharing between EOTAS settings and mainstream schools	Currently inconsistent but examples of good practice evident	All mainstream schools share information promptly, accurately and complete panel referrals appropriately	1 year	Good practice to be shared. New, streamlined panel processes to be developed
Reduction in number of fixed-term exclusions and/or permanent exclusions	Lack of an effective managed move protocol contributes to higher fixed-term exclusions and permanent exclusions	Significant reduction in fixed-term exclusions and permanent exclusions through new early move/managed protocols	1 year	Work towards no permanent exclusions within two years
Reduction in the number of young people at risk of becoming NEET in EOTAS	Numbers of NEET reducing but reaching a plateau	Target no NEET on leaving EOTAS at the end of Year 11 through targeted	3 years	

		support		
New provision will improve wellbeing outcomes	Current accommodation is inadequate, in poor repair and does not meet need for adequate welfare and recreational facilities	New provision will improve attitudes towards accommodation and allow for improved wellbeing	2 years	Dependent on timescale of new premises

10. Financial implications

Capital

- 10.1 It is not possible to provide a robust estimate of the capital cost for the proposal at this stage as detailed feasibility and design work is required to determine the most appropriate way to deliver the required accommodation and facilities on the site. This could be by extensive remodelling of existing buildings, a complete new build on the site, or a combination of the two. A rough indicative estimate of the capital cost of a new build at the Cockett House site for the three PRU facilities is around £6.5m.
- 10.2 The above figure is inclusive of:
- 10.2.1 fees;
 - 10.2.2 demolition costs;
 - 10.2.3 external landscaping; and
 - 10.2.4 optimism bias.
- 10.3 It must be again stressed however that this figure is a very high-level indicative estimate, and before a more accurate cost estimate can be provided an appropriate RIBA Stage 1 site masterplan options report would be required, which would provide the following detailed information:
- 10.3.1 highways and transport assessment;
 - 10.3.2 desktop geo-tech ground condition survey;
 - 10.3.3 ecology survey;
 - 10.3.4 archaeology desktop survey;
 - 10.3.5 drainage survey;
 - 10.3.6 flood review;
 - 10.3.7 planning policy context and assessment;
 - 10.3.8 cost consultancy;

- 10.3.9 site services review and strategy;
- 10.3.10 more detailed and informed accommodation requirements;
and
- 10.3.11 detailed asbestos surveys.

10.4 We are seeking corporate funding to support the capital works required for this scheme which will increase the substantial existing funding deficit on the Council's overall capital programme. Any capital expenditure incurred will effectively be unsupported borrowing given the flat settlement on capital for 2017-2018.

Revenue

10.5 Current costs exceed the available base budget for the services and as such significant additional revenue funding is required in each year to deliver the enhanced level of provision for pupils proposed in this report.

10.6 It is important to note that the Education Department budget does not have sufficient capacity to support the revenue or capital costs associated with this proposal. Therefore, should the proposal above be agreed as the preferred model, significant additional corporate funding will need to be secured in order to progress the recommendation.

10.7 Similarly, due to current pressures (relating in the main to interim staffing and accommodation issues); it is highly unlikely that the savings of £340k identified against the Education Department's behaviour support budget line will be met during FY2016-2017.

10.8 It is important to note that additional ER/VR costs will need to be factored in the costings model. However, understandably, at this moment in time, officers are unable to predict the level of ER/VR interest.

10.9 There are clear and immediate revenue and capital financial implications arising from this report. Acceptance of any of these options will result in additional expenditure from 2017-2018 onwards. Given the current financial position of the Council, it is assumed at the current time that any additional revenue resources required will be contained within existing budget provision or will be the subject of an additional budget bid (with specific consequential savings identified).

11. Timeframe

11.1 Establishing additional provision will require consultation for implementation in September 2017.

11.2 The timetable for City and County of Swansea to extensively overhaul its entire EOTAS service to ensure future provision best meets the needs of vulnerable young people is shown below. Failure to meet these timelines would result in a delay of establishing additional provision and therefore a delay in improved provision.

Table 6 Timeline for completion

Date	Milestone	Responsible Officer
September 2016	Additional devolution of funding to secondary schools begins (Memorandum of Understanding with schools in place)	Lindsay Harvey
October 2016	Draft business plan submitted for approval	Nick Williams
October 2016	Business plan submitted to Cabinet Member for Education for approval	Nick Williams
October 2016	Cabinet away-day	Chris Sivers
November 2016	Head of Swansea PRU post (re)advertised	Lindsay Harvey
December 2016	Head of Swansea PRU appointed	Lindsay Harvey
March 2017 – dependent on availability and timescale of feasibility works	Physical locations and capital funding for PRU A, PRU B and PRU C determined and any necessary transitional arrangements	Brian Roles
November 2016	Start to undertake EIA	Rhodri Jones
January 2017	Cabinet for approval for consultation	Chris Sivers
January 2017	Revised “early move” protocol established to further support managed moves	Nick Williams
January 2017	Start consultation (allow 6 weeks)	Rhodri Jones
January 2017	Commission feasibility and design to RIBA Stage 1 /2 for accommodation	Andrew Shaw
March 2017	Publish consultation report	Rhodri Jones
March 2017	Corporate Briefing	Chris Sivers
April 2017	Cabinet	Councillor Raynor
April 2017	Allow 10 days’ call-in period	Nick Williams
April 2017	Head of Swansea PRU commences duties	Lindsay Harvey
May 2017	Swansea PRU Senior Leadership Team (SLT) positions advertised (i.e. Deputy Head of PRU, Head of PRU A and Head of PRU B)	Head of Swansea PRU

May 2017	SLT posts appointed	Head of PRU
May 2017	Support Team posts advertised	Head of PRU
May 2017	Remaining Support Team posts appointed	Head of PRU
May 2017	Council	Councillor Raynor
June 2017	New enhanced VAP in place	Gavin Evans
June 2017	Co-working arrangements with Prevention services in place	Gavin Evans
June 2017	Proceed to planning application subject to outcome of feasibility / design	Andrew Shaw
July 2017	School in-house provision mapped	Head of PRU
July 2017	Tracking/performance framework developed for the enhanced VAP	Gavin Evans
August 2017	SLT and remaining support team posts commence duties	Head of PRU
September 2017	New service model implemented with PRU C in place	Head of PRU
September 2017	Planning application determined	n/a
September 2017 (slipped to September 2018 if Band B scheme)	Out to tender for completion of design/construction works	Andrew Shaw
April 2018 (slipped to April 2019 if Band B scheme)	Start construction works	Andrew Shaw
April 2018	New Behaviour and Wellbeing Strategy in place	Head of PRU
April 2019 (slipped to April 2020 if Band B scheme)	Completion of building work on the three physical settings to accommodate the PRU A, B and C	Andrew Shaw

12. Next steps

- 12.1 Officers will need to establish a communication plan in line with approval and timeframe as above. It is also important that the activities listed above are completed in line with identified dates.

13. Legal implications

- 13.1 The various permutations will necessitate the legal implications to be reviewed and updated on a regular basis as the matter progresses.

- 13.2 The Education (Pupil Referral Units) Application of Enactments) (Wales) Regulations of 2007 and 2015 stipulate what aspects of primary and secondary legislation which exist in relation to mainstream schools are also applicable to pupil referral units. These statutory requirements will need to be in place whichever future iteration of provision is established and should be in place for the current pupil referral unit provision. Examples include the need for a school development plan, a written statement in relation to sex education and policies to promote good discipline and behaviour on the part of its pupils.
- 13.3 Part 1 of the Staffing of Maintained Schools (Wales) Regulations 2006 applies (subject to modifications) to pupil referral units as it would to mainstream schools. Should the proposals involve the appointment of new staff then legal advice should be sought as to the applicability of these regulations.
- 13.4 The Education (Pupil Referral Unit) (Management Committees etc.) (Wales) Regulations 2014 and the accompanying guidance will need to be followed to ensure that any future provision has an appropriately constituted management committee and instrument of government. Advice should be sought on the implication of these Regulations when the future provision is identified.
- 13.5 It is a requirement for pupil referral units to be registered with Welsh Government. Depending on the model and site preferred, this registration may require updating or resubmitting to ensure ongoing compliance.
- 13.6 Legal advice should be sought on an ongoing basis in relation to the employment law implications should the proposals being developed include a restructure of staff resources.
- 13.7 While not directly applicable to pupil referral units, the School Organisation Code 2013 provides guidance as to the considerations to be had when making changes to school organisation. It is recommended that if there is a significant change proposed such as a change to the school site or a reduction in school places then the guidance in the Code is considered. The Code also provides guidance in relation to ensuring quality and standards in education and assessing the impact of proposals on quality and standards which would provide officers with a helpful benchmark for deliberations.
- 13.8 Regard should be had to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child at all times when developing proposals and particularly in relation to proposals which directly impact upon young people.
- 13.9 Officers should consider how proposals when advanced will match the stated aims and requirements of the Welsh-Medium Education Strategy and the City and County of Swansea Welsh in Education Strategic Plan (WESP) 2014-2017 (and subsequent WESPs).

14. Equality and engagement implications

- 14.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) screening form has been completed with the agreed outcome that a full EIA report was required. The full EIA report will be drafted once the locations of the potential settings are decided upon.
- 14.2 Service provision for Welsh speakers is recognised as a specific (potential) requirement and any solution must address this aspect. As detailed in the EIA screening, further work on this is needed to inform any final decision.

Background papers:

None

Appendices:

Appendix A	Details and further background information on recent PRU provision in City and County of Swansea
Appendix B	PRU senior staffing structure
Appendix C	EOTAS future accommodation briefing
Appendix D	Risk register
Appendix E	EOTAS project plan