

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 30 MARCH 2021****REPORT OF: MRS JULIE ILES, CABINET MEMBER FOR ALL-AGE LEARNING****LEAD OFFICER: RACHAEL WARDELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND LIFELONG LEARNING****SUBJECT: ALTERNATIVE CURRICULUM PATHWAYS AND REINTEGRATION SUPPORT****ORGANISATION STRATEGY PRIORITY AREA: GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT/ TACKLING HEALTH INEQUALITY/ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE/EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Alternative Provision (AP) is “education outside school, arranged by local authorities or schools, for pupils who do not attend mainstream school for reasons such as exclusion, behaviour issues, school refusal, short or long term illness” (Alternative Provision Statutory guidance for local authorities, 2013).

The Alternative Provision (AP) Strategy sets out the ambition for pupils who need to access AP. It will be used to ensure AP delivers positive educational and wellbeing outcomes for young people. It will also ensure that the significant resources Surrey County Council (SCC) and educational settings commit to AP are joined up across the system of provision, and children and young people get the right support at the right time in their learning journey.

The existing Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) estate is not fit for purpose and does not meet the educational needs of our most vulnerable learners. The recommendations in this report seek to ensure that the permanent PRU settings meet the minimum Department for Education space standards and are suitably located within communities to appropriately meet the needs of our vulnerable learners.

There has been extensive engagement and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders over the past six months on the vision and principles for AP in Surrey. These include Headteachers who manage PRUs, school leaders within the Primary, Secondary and Special School Phase Councils, children and young people themselves and their parents and carers, and key members and officers within Surrey County Council. This engagement provides clear support for the proposed strategic direction.

This report seeks endorsement of the strategic direction for AP and to enable the work on renewing the PRU estate to commence.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. Cabinet endorse the vision and principles of the Alternative Provision strategy (paragraphs 9-14),
2. Cabinet note the developments in the previously agreed capital works to upgrade the county's Pupil Referral Units (paragraphs 15-20),
3. Cabinet approves the delegation of authority to agree individual projects and resources to the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning and Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support, subject to a detailed business case for each scheme passing through Property Panel and Capital Programme Panel,
4. An amount of £0.5m is transferred from the current pipeline budget to begin the development of more detailed plans for individual sites.

## REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The proposed strategy will provide a shared ambition for children, vision, and a set of principles to develop a consistent high-quality countywide AP offer. The implementation of these proposals will provide an integrated system of alternative provision focussed on supporting children and young people at an earlier stage and enabling them to remain more often in their local school provision with their friends and siblings. The systemic approach will drive improvements in outcomes for children and young people accessing alternative provision, returning them more quickly and successfully to full time education. The investment proposals will ensure that all facilities meet the minimum standards required and go further to provide environments that ensure children feel valued, support children with a broad curriculum and ensure that their emotional health and wellbeing is a priority.

## DETAILS:

### Introduction

1. At any given time, approximately 750-800 Surrey children and young people are in AP, equating to around 0.5% of the population of those aged 5-16 years in Surrey's schools. Boys are more likely to be in AP in Surrey, as are pupils in years 10 and 11. AP is often seen as a solution for children who have been excluded, who have social, emotional or mental health needs (not necessarily with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP), who have complex medical needs, require temporary or part time support to meet a need or require access to a more diverse curriculum than can be offered in a mainstream school.
2. AP is defined as "education outside school, arranged by local authorities or schools, for pupils who do not attend mainstream school for reasons such as exclusion, behaviour issues, school refusal, short- or long-term illness". This is the DfE's definition in Alternative Provision Statutory guidance for local authorities (2013). AP is also accessed in our Further Education (FE) colleges in order to provide a broader curriculum offer. It is for children of compulsory school age (up to and including Yr11). For young people aged over 16 years, our Participation Strategy sets out our vision and commitments.
3. Both SCC and schools commission AP for children and young people. SCC has a statutory duty to do so where pupils have been permanently excluded, and for other pupils who –

because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such arrangements being made.

4. Need for AP is driven by both exclusions (both fixed term and permanent) as well as pupils' social, emotional or mental health needs or complex health needs. Pupils do not need to have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) to access AP. In addition, a minority of pupils require alternative curriculum pathways to the traditional route of GCSEs - often vocational pathways.
5. Alternative Provision in Surrey is currently delivered through:
  - 5 Educational Pupil Referral Units (PRUs)
  - 3 Medical or Specialist PRUs
  - Access to Education service
  - Hospital Education
  - Independent Providers
  - Further Education Colleges (FE)
6. There is also an array of provision intended to prevent children and young people from needing full-time AP which is often in the form of additional support within mainstream schools. This is a critical component of the broader AP system. It could be outreach offered by a range of organisations including PRUs and Special Schools/Settings (each school makes its own arrangements in addition to that which is commissioned by the local authority), Learning Support Units within schools and Nurture Groups. In addition, funding is delegated to quadrants to commission preventative services on a quadrant basis, known as Surrey Alternative Learning Provision (SALP).
7. The PRU estate is in need of upgrading and a capital investment of £23.7m was approved at Cabinet on 26 May 2020. This consisted of £0.8m, which was allocated for the works on Pewley Hill, along with a further £0.2m to be drawn down from the pipeline budget for immediate remedial works. A further £22.7m was notionally allocated as part of the pipeline budget to renew the PRU estate.
8. The urgent remedial works were coordinated by SCC Facilities Management Teams between October 2020 and February 2021 to ensure that existing PRU buildings remain safe and fully functional on their current sites until the permanent solutions are delivered. Officers and education setting leaders have spent time developing the strategic direction for AP to inform the direction of the capital works and are now in a position to recommend the way forward, seeking Cabinet's approval to proceed.

### **Strategic Direction**

9. Surrey shares the DfE's vision that:  
**Every child deserves an excellent education and the chance to fulfil their potential, whatever their background, needs or location in the county. Children in alternative provision deserve these opportunities too.** ([Creating Opportunity For All](#), March 2018).

We envisage that every child accessing AP will be:

- Given access to a diverse, imaginative and engaging curriculum that is relevant, appropriate and includes core subjects
- Educated within their local community where possible

- Supported by a flexible, multi-disciplinary intervention according to need which considers the whole child within their family context
- Involved in developing a plan which focuses on their reintegration back into mainstream school where appropriate

In addition, we will work collaboratively across schools, the local authority, and health services to ensure that where possible, we respond to children's needs before they escalate and require AP. Many children currently accessing alternative provision require a special school placement as outlined in their EHCP. If it becomes apparent that a child needs specialist education, it is our aspiration that they are swiftly moved to the right specialist school according to their needs.

10. Our ambition for AP in Surrey is to:

- Increase the number of children and young people supported in mainstream provision, reducing the need for off-site provision
- Continue to reduce the number of exclusions from and within schools (both fixed term and permanent)
- Increase the number of pupils successfully reintegrated into mainstream provision
- Reduce the rising number of young people receiving independent tuition
- Monitor and improve the educational and wellbeing outcomes of children and young people who use AP
- Increase the number of young people who are on a pathway to Further Education
- Improve commissioning of independent providers
- Gain a better understanding of AP pupils needs and outcomes and apply consistency of opportunity across the county

11. The new strategy for AP in Surrey will promote a collective system in which educational settings, community services, health and education support services all play a crucial part in responding to vulnerable children and assisting with reintegration to school; it moves away from viewing AP as a 'market' with a selection of services, or a number of places to be commissioned. Demand for AP is driven by a combination of how schools approach inclusion, the support available to enable inclusion, a collective understanding of how to respond to social, emotional and mental health needs and behaviour that schools find challenging and children for whom a standardised route to GCSE's is not appropriate. It has been well documented that 'the more AP that exists, the more it is filled' (see this [IntegratED report](#), pg. 64) – solutions need to come from a whole system approach to meeting needs.

12. Surrey will adopt the following characteristics of a successful AP system, taken from [Alternative provision market analysis research report](#) (DfE, 2018):

Theme	Key Characteristics of a Successful Local AP System
1 The make-up of local provision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Quantity</b> – will depend on strategic decisions about the role of local AP and other inclusion support. Must link to inclusion strategy and must be equitable access across county.</li> <li>2. <b>Range</b> – having the right range to (a) meet pupils’ needs and (b) provide appropriate support options and pathways (in-school, outreach, turnaround, long-term placements)</li> <li>3. <b>Quality</b> – having a well developed Quality Assurance framework and building provider quality pro-actively</li> </ol>
2 How local AP is used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. <b>Financial Realism</b> – a collective understanding of local resources available</li> <li>5. <b>Responsibilities</b> – (a) school-level for individual pupils, their outcomes and destinations, (b) collective school responsibility for fair and equitable use of AP, (c) oversight and Quality Assurance role for local authority – and links made to early help and SEND</li> <li>6. <b>Strategic planning</b> – pro-active fostering of inclusion to meet needs and manage demand (not just finding placements). Tight, informed, responsive commissioning</li> </ol>
3 The effectiveness of the local AP system	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. <b>Responsiveness</b> – ensuring providers are connected to the local system and see their role as responding to needs, not defining and performing within their own niche</li> <li>8. <b>Outcomes</b> – collectively agreed and performance measured. Aligned to strategic priorities and that allow AP providers to demonstrate impact</li> <li>9. <b>Funding</b> – is used flexibly to incentivise inclusion &amp; support strategic priorities. Decisions are informed by impact on the High Needs Block and benchmarking is used to ensure value for money</li> </ol>

13. The Strategy will set out a streamlined AP Pathway which will enable the local authority to meet its duty in maintaining a single register of young people in AP, as well as monitor their progress as a result of the AP. Currently, educational settings as well as the local authority can commission AP and as a result the local authority is not always aware of which young people are accessing AP, nor able to measure its impact on outcomes. A new ‘gateway’ will maintain and monitor that single register and collect data about young people’s educational as well as wellbeing outcomes to inform AP service planning.

14. Some of the ways in which this strategic approach to AP can be delivered are through the following operational developments:

- i. **Inclusive schools with preventative practice.** School-led developments that encourage inclusion, feature within our Inclusion Strategy and test ideas through early adopters. The SALP network funding should be reviewed within this context to ensure it is fully preventative and supports inclusive education.
- ii. **Personalised education** which promotes a range of vocational pathways in partnership with our FE colleges and increases the reach of our Access to Education (A2E) tuition service. We also propose strengthening the AP links with Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD) services.
- iii. **Off-site interventions at our Pupil Referral Units** providing excellent AP within one of our PRUs. New service level agreements will be drawn up which set out the outcomes required for children and young people from these provisions which are monitored regularly.
- iv. **Excellent commissioning of independent providers** which provides value for money and assurance of high-quality provision for young people. A shift is proposed from a high-level usage of the independent sector, to a smaller series of key relationships with excellent providers that are commissioned well through a framework or preferred provider arrangement. Young people who would previously have been placed with a private provider to instead remain in mainstream school with additional support or be placed within our PRUs or A2E service.

## **Capital Developments**

15. There are significant ambitions to transform the PRU estate. The vision and principles underpinning our strategic approach provides the context and rationale for retaining the existing 240 educational PRU places without any increase in places. Any future additional investment in AP must support the inclusion and early intervention agenda described above.
16. At present many of the 240 places cannot be delivered due to building constraints and it is envisaged that when the new or refurbished buildings are in place, and the numbers on roll are at capacity then it is anticipated that there will be a reduction in the use of independent AP providers.
17. Service Level Agreements will be drawn up with the PRUs to provide the full suite of 240 places, spread across the county, with equalised funding rates across the 5 establishments. An average of 3 snapshots of occupancy over 2019/20 indicated that only 74% of the 240 places were occupied – with reasons cited being mainly the building facilities. PRUs have worked hard to replace physical education places in their sites with outreach services to overcome the facilities issues. All forecasts project that in the years ahead the full suite of 240 educational places will be required.
18. It is recommended that the existing 9 small sites (excluding HOPE and the two Medical PRUs) are consolidated into 5 larger sites through the proposed capital developments. This will provide a PRU in each quadrant serving between 40-75 pupils in each and an additional primary PRU in the north serving 24 children (mainly in Yr6). Consolidating within 5 sites will mean that each will be large enough to provide economies of scale when drawing in other pastoral support services, such as family liaison work. Across the northern half of the county there will be 124 places in three establishments – two secondary PRUs and a primary PRU. Across the two southern quadrants there will be 116 places in two establishments: two combined primary/secondary PRUs.
19. The pipeline funding approved by Cabinet on 26 May 2020 will be used to facilitate the development of the PRU estate.
20. Annex 1 details the appraisal of existing PRU assets which was undertaken by officers from SCC Land & Property and Education teams. This process has been informed by the 2019 commissioned assessment of the PRU education sites' internal and external spaces against the Government's guidance for the area of buildings for primary and secondary Alternative Provision. The most recent surveys, feasibility studies and site visits for the urgent remedial works across the PRU estate have also provided critical detail for assessing the potential of each building and site's sustained usage in the long term.

## **Key Performance Indicators**

21. A set of KPIs have been developed which will monitor impact of both preventative work to reduce the need for AP, as well as the impact of AP itself on our children, young people and their families. These are:
  - a. Inclusion activity prior to needing AP (models of practice, outcomes for the child/young person, engagement of the family)

- b. Admission to AP (by year and school, pupil attendance, percentage of all excluded children, previous efforts of managed moves, previous engagement of other agencies, e.g. CAMHS)
- c. Outcomes of AP, both AP assessed and self-assessed by child or young person (attendance, progress compared with earlier patterns, behaviour, health & wellbeing, academic & vocational achievements, including literacy and numeracy, perceived benefit of the AP)
- d. Reintegration / Next Placement (reintegrated to mainstream school with support, progression at mainstream school within first year after AP, admission to specialist provision, progress to Further Education, NEET, re-admission to AP frequency, by school, and includes other agencies involved)
- e. Quality of AP (contracts or SLAs developed and across the market, buildings and facilities that inspire)

## CONSULTATION:

22. Key to the success of a whole system AP strategy is endorsement of the vision and approach by a range of stakeholders who operate within the system. Care has been taken throughout the last 6 months to have meaningful conversations with:
- a. Primary, Secondary and Special School Phase Leads
  - b. Primary, Secondary and Special School Phase Councils
  - c. Pupil Referral Unit leaders
  - d. Senior council officers
  - e. Subject Matter Experts
  - f. Schools Forum and its sub-group, the High Needs Block working group
  - g. SEND System Partnership
  - h. Family Voice Surrey
  - i. SaFE (Schools Alliance for Excellence)
  - j. Health Partners
23. In addition, SurreySays surveys have been conducted with:
- a. 65 children and young people (65% of whom had direct experience of AP)
  - b. 78 parents and carers (51% of whose children and young people had direct experience of AP)
  - c. 65 Surrey Headteachers
24. The initial findings of the consultations all point to support from the sector as well as children, young people and their parents for a focus on inclusion within flexible education settings that allow for different teaching styles and individual support where needed. In particular, mental health support was cited as critical as well as a swift response where special educational needs are identified. A quiet space within mainstream schools was also flagged as a helpful alternative provision. Where children must travel to off-site AP, around 55% felt travelling long distances, e.g. out of county, would negatively affect their attendance. In addition, 56% parents and carers felt that whole family learning would be beneficial to their children's AP outcomes.
25. An initial analysis of the Headteacher survey has been undertaken which indicates that:
- The vast majority of schools (92%) agreed with the proposed alternative provision and inclusive practice approach
  - Currently only a quarter of schools (25%) offer vocational training opportunities or have direct links with educational settings that do

- There are mixed responses on whether schools felt they or an alternative provider within Surrey's 'family' of educational establishments could meet personalised education needs; funding a key issue
- Nearly two-thirds of schools (63%) agreed with the proposed A2E approach – those that didn't were 'unsure' and wanted more information
- Majority of schools (85%) agreed with the proposed AP gateway approach, and three quarters (75%) are happy to facilitate this
- Under half of schools (46%) of schools directly commission services from PRUs
- 45% of Headteachers are not assured of the educational and health and wellbeing outcomes of AP for their pupils

A fuller analysis of the Headteacher survey is underway and will be used to inform the final Strategy when published in spring 2021.

26. The Cabinet Member for All-age Learning has been consulted and kept informed of progress throughout the last 6 months of developing the strategic approach.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

27. Without thoroughly measuring the impact of AP we will not be certain of having a positive impact on children and young people's outcomes.

28. Numbers of children and young people that are judged to need AP have been rising year on year with associated costs to the High Needs Block. Without joint ownership of the challenge with schools, through a whole system approach to AP and the impact of early intervention monitored; the number of children whose education can't be delivered in mainstream school will continue to rise and the financial problem will continue to grow.

29. Continued use of the independent sector at the increasing rate, as has been occurring, will likely increase costs and quality will not be fully assured.

#### **FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

30. The strategy will improve value for money in a number of ways:

- When AP is required, shorter interventions of up to 6 weeks will be sufficient for the majority of children before reintegrating into mainstream provision.
- Early intervention will mean less reliance on longer term AP e.g. PRU or independent sector AP placements or provision
- Greater access to maintained AP provision will reduce unit cost comparative to use of the external market which will benefit schools and the local authority.
- The capital development works will ensure that PRUs are operating to their full capacity.

31. The SEND Transformation programme has estimated that there is the ability to deliver efficiencies by up to £1.2m as a result of the delivery of the above in 2021/22; this may be greater in 2022/23 if demand does not increase due to the additional impacts of Covid 19 (seen previously in the Autumn 2020).

32. The proposed £0.5m to be transferred from the pipeline will enable plans to begin to be developed for the proposed sites.

33. Detailed business cases will be submitted to Capital Programme Panel once appropriate sites have been identified and scheme plans developed. These will need to set out the capital investment required, running costs of the new facilities and efficiencies achievable.
34. If schemes do not progress to become operational assets, then any amounts spent against the £0.5m allocation will need to be transferred to revenue as abortive costs. This is not factored into the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

**SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY**

35. Although significant progress has been made over the last twelve months to improve the Council’s financial position, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2021/22 remains uncertain. The public health crisis has resulted in increased costs which may not be fully funded. With uncertainty about the ongoing impact of this and no clarity on the extent to which both central and local funding sources might be affected in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority in order to ensure stable provision of services in the medium term. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the proposal to develop the AP provision within Surrey. The financial benefits will be factored into the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER**

36. Although the Alternative Provision Strategy will be a new strategy for the Council, it is founded upon the existence of well-established educational provision which has enabled the Council to meet its duties to educate children and young people. The Strategy will enhance the Council’s ability to do this and the responses to consultation demonstrate that it has the support of the professionals and families that are involved with these services.

**EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY**

37. An Equalities Impact Assessment screening tool has been attached at annex 3. This has been drafted considering the recommended strategic approach to AP outlined in this Cabinet Paper, where there are no negative impacts identified.
38. A full Equalities Impact Assessment is likely to be needed to accompany the full AP Strategy when published in the spring and will be considered in detail by the Cabinet Member for All-age Learning at that stage.

**OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

39. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

<b>Area assessed:</b>	<b>Direct Implications:</b>
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	Children Looked After are more than five times more likely to have a fixed period exclusion than their peers and Children in Need are about three and a

	half times more likely to be excluded for a fixed period. As with children who have an EHC plan, statutory exclusion guidance sets out that head teachers should 'as far as possible' avoid permanently excluding a looked after child. This strategy echoes <u>SCC's Corporate Parenting Strategy</u> which states that we will promote high aspirations, and seek to secure the best outcomes, for children and young people who are looked after.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Environmental sustainability	The design philosophy for any new development is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. Any adjustments to the built form will be undertaken in line with the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy. The provision of education places closer to home will reduce the average journey times for learners with EHCPs and is aligned with the vision and aspirations of Surrey's SEND Transport Transformation programme.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

#### WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

40. The next steps following approval of this report are:

- a. The AP Strategy will be published spring 2021.
- b. A young-person friendly version of the strategy will also be produced by spring 2021.
- c. A service action plan will be produced by spring 2021 to take forward the recommended enablers to achieve the strategic direction
- d. The upgrade programme for the PRU facilities will begin with feasibility studies in early summer 2021
- e. An Inclusion Strategy will be produced by summer 2021 which will set out support available for educational settings to include pupils

---

#### Contact Officer:

Liz Mills, Director Education, Lifelong Learning and Culture, 07968 834579

#### Consulted:

Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning,

Executive Director for CFLL,

CFLL Leadership Team,

ELLC Leadership Team,

Finance Team  
Land and Property Team  
Vulnerable Learners Assistant Directors  
SEND System Partnership,  
Family Voice Surrey,  
SAfE,  
Phase Council School Leaders,  
AP Headteachers,  
Schools Forum,  
The High Needs Block working group,  
Surrey Headteachers,  
Health Partners,  
Children and young people,  
Parents and carers

**Annexes:**

Annex 1- Balanced Scorecard  
Annex 2- Proposed Site Changes  
Annex 3 – Equality Impact Assessment Screening Tool

**Sources/background papers:**

[Alternative Provision](#), Statutory guidance for local authorities, January 2013

[Alternative provision: education outside school](#), Research, June 2011

[Alternative school provision: findings of a three year survey](#). Findings from an Ofsted survey on the use of off-site alternative provision by schools and pupil referral units, February 2016

[Alternative provision: year 11 transition funding](#). Sets out the financial support available to alternative provision (AP) schools and colleges to support current year 11 students into post-16 education. June 2020

[Applying Corporate Parenting Principles to Looked-After Children and Care Leavers](#)

[Behaviour and discipline in schools: guide for governing bodies](#), July 2013

[Children missing education Statutory guidance for local authorities](#), September 2016

[Education for children with health needs who cannot attend school](#), Statutory guidance for local authorities, January 2013

[Exclusion from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England](#), September 2017

[Implementing Inclusive Education](#) - Rapid Review, August 2018

[Promoting the education of looked-after children and previously looked-after children](#),  
Statutory guidance for local authorities, February 2018

[Schools: guide to the 0 to 25 SEND code of practice](#), Advice for school governing  
bodies/proprietors, senior leadership teams, SENCOs and classroom staff, September 2014,

[SEND code of practice: 0 to 25 years](#), June 2014

[Supporting pupils at school with medical conditions](#) Statutory guidance for governing bodies  
of maintained schools and proprietors of academies in England, December 2015

[Timpson Review of School Exclusion](#) – May 2019

---

# Annex 1- Balanced Scorecard

Balanced Scorecard : Planning Area:		Existing PRU Provision County-wide																		
Attendees:																				
Information required		Project context		Key: 1 - 5		RAG		(out of 50)												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map of the area</li> <li>Maintenance issues/condition</li> <li>Plan of sites</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupil numbers – existing &amp; required</li> <li>Planning area projections</li> <li>Number, location &amp; capacity of existing schools</li> </ul>		1 - Definitely suitable 3 - Suitable 5 - Definitely not suitable				≤16 17-33 ≥34												
Note: If categories with an * (e.g. education standards) are scored as 5 - a red risk status should be adopted																				
Description of proposed change																				
Site 1		Site 2		Site 3		Site 4		Site 5		Site 6		Site 7		Site 8		Site 9				
Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		Is the site suitable for use, and/or expansion as part of the developing AP strategy?		
Mechanism																				
Reason that all parties agree not to take forward:																				
Education																				
School		Site 1		Site 2		Site 3		Site 4		Site 5		Site 6		Site 7		Site 8		Site 9		
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Adequate non - classroom infrastructure		5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5	Unsuitable for ongoing future development	5
Adequate external area inc playing fields		5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5	Inadequate size for need	5
Admissions and Transport issues		5	Difficult access and inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4	Inadequate for current needs- would need additional space for drop-off and parking if expanded	4
Education RAG		14		14		14		14		14		14		14		14		14		
Property																				
Matrix		Site 1		Site 2		Site 3		Site 4		Site 5		Site 6		Site 7		Site 8		Site 9		
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Capacity/space on site*		4	Very small building with very restricted associated outdoor space	5	No outdoor space restricted site with no space to expand- no green space	5	Very small building with very restricted associated outdoor space- no green space	5	Very small building with very restricted associated outdoor space- no green space	5	Very restricted building with very restricted associated outdoor space- no green space	5	Very restricted building with very restricted associated outdoor space- no green space	5	Very restricted building with very restricted associated outdoor space- no green space	5	Very restricted building with very restricted associated outdoor space- some green space	4	Site as stands not suitable as sharing with SW Social work team Restricted outdoor space	
Suitability and phase of school		3	Works as is but needs some work to deal with wc and kitchen issues	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	3	Works as is but not possible to develop further	
New sites required/acquisitions/disposals		3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Requires new site for expansion works- site constrained	3	Could be developed on site but would require temporary accommodation- consider moving to new site	3	Decision to be made on future of whole site- is it to become a PRU / SW social work hub, or other space for services/residential. Requirement for new site is dependent upon the decision above	
Building conditions		3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	3	Reasonable condition	
MTFF indicative funding		3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires site acquisition and building funding	3	Requires building funding, and possibly site acquisition	
External funding opportunities (e.g. TBN)		3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	
Planned maintenance		3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	3	Will need some increased Maintenance going forward	
CIL/S106		3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	3	to be identified	
Localised development impacts		4	Forms part of larger campus of education and SCC buildings- unlikely to be able to expand on existing site- unlikely to be able to redevelop sites other than for SCC service uses- needs new site	4	In residential area, so possibility for redevelopment. Any works will have major impact on residents	4	In residential area, so possibility for redevelopment. Any works will have major impact on residents	5	In residential area, so possibility for redevelopment. Any works will have major impact on residents	5	In residential area, so possibility for redevelopment. Any works will have major impact on residents	5	Could be developed on site- but requires full demolition and rebuild to make it suitable- which requires use of temporary accommodation. Better use of resources to relocate to new site. Possibility to redevelop for other service uses or residential	5	Could be developed on site- but requires full demolition and rebuild to make it suitable- which requires use of temporary accommodation. Better use of resources to relocate to new site. Possibility to redevelop for other service uses or residential	5	Could be developed on site- but requires full demolition and rebuild to make it suitable- which requires use of temporary accommodation. Better use of resources to relocate to new site. Possibility to redevelop for other service uses or residential	3	Could be developed on site- but requires relocation of SW Social work hub. Access is relatively straight forward and minimal impact on neighbours.	
Ownership/estates implications (e.g. academies, diocese)		3	SCC- due to academize 1 April 2021	3	SCC	1	Outside flood zone	3	SCC	3	SCC	3	SCC- due to academize 1 April 2021	3	SCC- due to academize 1 April 2021	3	SCC- due to academize 1 April 2021	3	SCC- due to academize 1 April 2021	
Property RAG		30		30		31		34		34		34		34		34		31		
Planning																				
Matrix		Site 1		Site 2		Site 3		Site 4		Site 5		Site 6		Site 7		Site 8		Site 9		
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Transport & Highways implications		4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	4	Limited parking and access for existing staff and pupils- will be exacerbated by increased numbers	
Greenbelt		4	Site wholly within greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	1	Not in Greenbelt	
Heritage		2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	2	No Known heritage issues	
Flood risk		1	Outside flood zone	3	In flood zone 1	1	Outside flood zone	1	Outside flood zone	3	In flood zone 1	1	Outside flood zone							
Planning RAG		27.5		25		20		20		25		20		20		32.5		20		
Overall RAG Rating																				
Overall RAG		75		72		65		68		73		68		68		81		68		
Conclusion:																				

Page 117

## **Annex 2- Proposed Site Changes**

The Proposed number of AP PRU sites to provide the future model is a reduction from 9 to 5. These would be located close to the pupil populations they serve to reduce travel times, and the age ranges as below

<b>AP Places Proposed</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Quadrant</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
<b>Site A</b>	<b>NE/NW</b>	24	
<b>Site B</b>	<b>NE</b>		60
<b>Site C</b>	<b>NW</b>		40
<b>Site D</b>	<b>SE</b>	12	60
<b>Site E</b>	<b>SW</b>	12	32
		48	192
	<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>	

It is proposed that the current sites would be reorganised as follows:

<b>Site</b>	<b>Retain</b>	<b>Dispose</b>	<b>Remodel</b>	<b>Relocate</b>	<b>Proposed future use</b>
1	Y		Y		Remodel on existing site to improve facilities and provide additional pupil places
2		Y		Y	Dispose of site, relocate to new purpose designed facility with appropriate outdoor space
3		Y		Y	Dispose of site, relocate to new purpose designed facility with appropriate outdoor space
4		Y		Y	Dispose of site, relocate to new purpose designed facility with appropriate outdoor space
5	Y		Y		Remodel on existing site to improve facilities and provide additional pupil places
6		Y		Y	Dispose of site, relocate to new purpose designed facility with appropriate outdoor space
7		Y		Y	Dispose of site, relocate to new purpose designed facility with appropriate outdoor space
8	Y		Y		Remodel on existing site to improve facilities and provide additional pupil places
9	Y		Y		Remodel on existing site to improve facilities and provide additional pupil places

This would require the acquisition of at least one site to ensure that the educational and family facilities required, and access to transport links can be provided.

### Annex 3 – Equality Impact Assessment Screening Tool

This tool will help you decide whether you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for a new policy, function or service or change to an existing one. You may also use this template to conduct a full functional EIA.

If you complete the tool, and this identifies either negative or positive impacts for residents, people who use services or staff with protected characteristics - you will need to complete a full EIA, which can be found on [SCC Info](#). If you decide not to complete an EIA, you must record this - explaining why an EIA is not necessary. This might take the form of minutes of a meeting, an internal email or as part of a service plan.

While working through the tool, think about the protected characteristics including: age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnerships, pregnancy and maternity **and any other relevant social identity characteristics** (for example part time and full time contract types, socio-economic status, social class, income, education and skills, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels). Consideration of all of these characteristics should be applied to both residents and staff.

Consider involving your project team or Directorate Equality Group in completing this.

Name of policy, function or service change being assessed:	Alternative Provision Strategy	
	YES	NO
1. Does any part of this policy, function or service pose any impact based on a person's protected characteristics?		x
2. Are there any proposed changes that could lead to impacts (both negative and positive) and reduced or improved satisfaction levels on staff or residents, who share a person's protected characteristics?		x
3. Based on your answers to questions 1 and 2, which protected and or other groups could be affected? (Please tick or specify) <b>Protected Groups:</b> Age <input type="checkbox"/> Disability <input type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and maternity <input type="checkbox"/> Race <input type="checkbox"/> Religion and belief <input type="checkbox"/> Sex <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and civil partnerships <input type="checkbox"/> Carers (protected by association) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other Groups:</b> Part Time and Full Time contract types <input type="checkbox"/> Socio-economic status (social class) <input type="checkbox"/> Income <input type="checkbox"/> Education and Skill <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployment <input type="checkbox"/> Residential Location <input type="checkbox"/> Family background <input type="checkbox"/>		
4. Are there likely to be any adverse impacts for people based on their socio-economic status?		x
5. Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		x
6. Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
7. Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		x
8. Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		x

If you have answered **yes** to any of the questions above, you will need to complete a full EIA using the pro forma [provided by Surrey County Council](#).

This page is intentionally left blank