

- **Back on Track pilot project**
- **Information in brackets current Ofsted grading**

ANNEX 2 - EXAMPLES LA PRU MODELS IN ENGLAND 2010

	NUMBER PRIMARY PRUS	NUMBER KS3 PRUS	NUMBER ALL AGE PRU	NUMBER KS4 PRU	NUMBER KS3/4 PRU	ALTERNATIVE MODELS TRIALLED
Worcestershire	3 (3/4/2)				3 (No information available as new provision)	Current models attached to behaviour partnerships. In addition web based learning used for small cohort students. LA beginning to consider co-location of PRUs to mainstream secondary sites.
*Herefordshire	1	1(3)		2 (2/1)		Pilot project : Years 7-10- based on intervention approaches to re-integrate into school. Project works with a range of external providers. 4 school based centers Senior leader line manager Facilities vary from 1 room to suite of rooms Counseling support given.. Centers offer outreach support. Outcomes to date reflect individual successes.
Shropshire	1(2) 6 pupils 2009		1(1) 6 sites			All Age PRU-Ofsted 2008 -links successes to significant strengths in Leadership and Management both at LA and PRU level. Focused on pupils achievements linked to appropriate accredited outcomes and very rigorous monitoring and review processes. In addition high quality supportive relationships are instrumental in bringing about pupils' excellent personal development." 1 all age PRU meets range of needs from medical to behavioural issues but on 6 Education Centres.
Staffordshire					6	(4 grade 2 2- grade 3) Located in districts so pupils not travelling vast distances.- working with Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships
*Rotherham (York And Humberside	1(2)			1(2)		School Behaviour and Attendance partnerships running 3 learning centres, making positive provision for most vulnerable KS3/4. Offering accreditation in core and vocational options in partnership . Evidence to date of increased engagement and improved attitude to learning within centres.

	NUMBER PRIMARY PRUS	NUMBER KS3 PRUS	NUMBER ALL AGE PRU	NUMBER KS4 PRU	NUMBER KS3/4 PRU	ALTERNATIVE MODELS TRIALLED
*Coventry		2 (2/2)		1(3)		3 Enterprise focused learning centres for the most disaffected and disengaged young people. External providers working in partnership with LA. Both provisions for Key Stage 4 Year 1 – have increased significantly pupils' attainment. Greater focus on monitoring by LA half-termly (through Virtual School) and targeted interventions. Year 11 pupils have over 90% attendance. LA currently developing 4 Learning Centers Year 10 managed by mainstream secondary – but with a target of 4 pupils. Moving towards Area Partnerships. Focus on small provisions localized to meet needs.
*Oxfordshire 1 PRU on 4 sites the most distant being 25 miles			1 (2)			4 week intervention programme for Key Stage 3 pupils followed by a support week and ongoing re-integration support. Delivered by a peripatetic PRU, working in partnership with private and voluntary sector. Early evidence suggests there is a reduction in fixed period and permanent exclusions.
Dudley			1(2)		1(new)	Discussing alternative models to provide PRU-type support in localities.
*Nottingham			1(3)	1 (4)		Pilot project- 3 cohorts 14-16 year olds permanently excluded, those without a school place and those on a school roll but at risk of being excluded. Work delivered in partnership with a wide range of vocational partners.
Sandwell	1(2)	3 (2/2/3)		3 (4)		PRUs attached to Behaviour Partnerships. Key Stage 4 PRU works in partnership with a range of alternative vocational providers Planned developments for all PRUs to co-located on mainstream secondary/primary sites.

ANNEX 3 - ALTERNATIVE SERVICE MODELS FOR PRUS

CURRENT MODEL – 1 PRU on four sites – catering for Primary, Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 pupils.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	
	Stay the same	Status Quo	Status Quo enhanced	Area PRUs at each Key Stage	Signs of change (mainstream co-location)	Multi inclusion centres in mainstream provision	Hybrid 1 – Intervention + transition + partnerships	Hybrid Model 2 – School model	
Primary	For all Key Stages	1 Primary PRU/ intervention	1 primary PRU/ intervention /multi agency team	3 primary PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas	3 primary PRUs/ intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas	In school support primary pupils	In school support primary pupils /out borough extreme pupils Transition PRU Year 6	Commission primary school partnerships to develop their own model to suit need of locality for Primary phase.	
Key Stage 3		1 PRU central county 1 PRU north county	1 Key Stage 3 PRU/ intervention	1 KS3/4 PRU/ intervention /_multi-agency team OR	3 Key Stage 3 PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas	3 Key Stage 3 PRUs/ intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas	Increase number Learning Support Units secondary school/ with re-integration clear expectation	LSUs in areas with moderate to high exclusion rates Managed moves where appropriate KS4 transition support	Commission Secondary schools partnerships to develop their own model to suit needs of locality for Key Stage 3
Key Stage 4			Outsource to private provider	1KS3 PRU/ intervention 1KS4 PRU/ intervention / multi agency team	3 Key Stage 4 PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas	3 Key Stage 4 PRUs/ intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas	Increase number Learning Support Units secondary school/ with re-integration clear expectation	KS4 PRU In partnership with college(s). eg studio school. Commissioned places.	Commission Secondary schools partnerships develop their own model to suit needs of localities Key Stage 4.
Risk	M	H	H	M	M	M	M	H	
Cost	L	H+	M	H	M	H	M	H	
	Good short term solution 2011-12.	Reasonable solution for KS1-3. KS4 - quality risk.	Depends on quality of other LA services.	Potentially variable quality over 9 centres.	Long term potential solution. Potentially variable quality.	Reasonable solution for KS1-3. Potential at KS4 for increased out of county at KS4.	Potential exclusions KS3. Significant staff development needs. Recommended long term solution.	Depends upon mature robust school partnerships. Likelihood of extreme cases needing out of county provision.	

NB - mixed models are also an option

ANNEX 4

MODEL 1 - STAY THE SAME- reducing from 4 to 2 sites	
Primary	For all Key Stages 1 PRU in Central (Pound Lane) and 1 PRU in north county (Kerseley).
Key Stage 3	
Key Stage 4	
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay the same – minimal changes required to segregate Key Stages. • Time frame to deliver changes quicker than other proposed models. • Reduction in staffing as no duplication, significantly saving on budgetary costs
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staying same -pupils continue to receive inadequate education. • Monitoring aspects of pupil progress by LA and PRUs not rigorous enough to support improvements. • Primary pupils receiving education on own or in a very small group • Current staff skills not in place to ensure a better educational experience for pupils • PRU continues to be in a category - Ofsted would close provision. • Costs and time to develop a PRU in north of county • Primary/Key Stage 3 pupils continue to be exposed to possible negative role models of Key stage 4 pupils. • No ownership/responsibility by mainstream schools, continued levels of exclusion. • Continued high levels of funding on transportation of pupils to PRUs • Continued high levels of funding on students out of borough
Time scale	September 2012 Dependent on appropriate site being found. Autumn Term 2011-Interim phase could involve moving to existing 2 sites in the interim period.

MODEL 2 - STATUS QUO– for Primary /Key Stage 3 Commission external providers Key Stage 4

Primary	1 Primary PRU/ intervention support for mainstream primary schools.
Key Stage 3	1 Key Stage 3 PRU/Intervention support for mainstream secondary schools.
Key Stage 4	Outsource to private provider (s) LA remains responsibility to monitor and be accountable for outcomes.
Benefits Primary/ Key Stage 3	<p>Provision exists for Primary/Key Stage 3 – quicker timescale for implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer Leadership and management focus over 1 Key Stage/phase and development of staffs’ specific skills, improving quality of provision. • Increased accountability for separate Key Stage provision, easier for LA to monitor. • Pupils not associate/pick up on poor role models of older pupils, supporting increased engagement in learning. • Clear focus on intervention /linked to host school with increased number returning to own school. • Appropriate accommodation already in place for primary /Key Stage 3 PRU (minimizing change costs)
Key Stage 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially better led and managed provision and better educational experiences Key Stage 4 pupils. • Increased personalized pathways/better outcomes for pupils at Key Stage 4?
Risks Primary/ Key Stage 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current skills not in place to establish effective primary/Key Stage 3 PRU. • 1 primary/1 Key Stage 3 provision increase time pupils currently travelling and transport costs. • No accountability for mainstream schools for pupils excluded. • .Staff skill set limited to Key Stage/phase teaching. • Increased initial costs to ensuring site suitable for Key Stage provision.
Key Stage 4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outsourcing Key Stage 4 – low quality of potential providers may not improve provision. Currently very few are able to offer accreditation in key skills as well as vocational aspects. Pupils would not necessarily access appropriate pastoral support/external agencies vital to impact on reducing their barriers to learning. • Outsourcing due to size of cohort could potentially be with at least 8+ providers, increased costs transport. • Due to nature of pupils needs, there will be a need to change placements at short notice to another provider- pupils not be educated. • Cost of outsourcing could significantly increase PRU budget – to meet personalized needs. This would still be responsibility of LA to monitor and review quality of provision for each pupil. Is there the capacity to achieve this successfully as well as managing an additional PRU? • Continued number exclusions- no accountability mainstream schools.
Timescale	Phased transition Primary– Autumn 2011 Key Stage 3 Spring 2012 Key Stage 4- September 2012 onwards.

Legal position- Local Authorities have core responsibilities in relation to providing suitable education for excluded pupils. This maybe provided with external providers, eg voluntary or private sector, including independent schools, work based learning providers and FE colleges. However the local Authority remains accountable for the quality of education.(Guidance to local authorities and schools - PRUs and alternative provision - Section 7 Education Act 1996)

MODEL 3 - STATUS QUO ENHANCED

Primary	1 primary PRU/intervention support for mainstream primary /multi agency team.
Key Stage 3	1 KS3/4 PRU/intervention support for mainstream secondary/multi agency team OR
Key Stage 4	1KS3 PRU/intervention support mainstream secondary/multi agency team 1KS4 PRU/intervention support mainstream secondary/ multi agency team.
Benefits All Key Stages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer Leadership and management focus over 1 Key Stage/phase supporting sharpened focus on monitoring and self-review and development of staffs specific skills. • Increased accountability for separate Key Stage provision- easier for LA to monitor smaller provisions and hold to account. • Pupils not associate/pick up on bad role models of older pupils, supporting increased engagement in learning. • Clear focus on intervention /linked to host school with increased number accessing normal curriculum. in own school . • Site/ accommodation already in place for Primary /Key Stage 3 PRU /KS4 PRU, enabling shorter time frame to deliver changes compared to other models. • Multi-agency team supporting personalized needs of pupils/families to impact on a faster response, aimed at impacting on reducing students barriers to learning. Pupils more quickly re-integrated.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 primary/1 Key Stage 3 /1 Key Stage 4 provision increase time pupils currently travelling and transport costs. • No accountability for mainstream schools for pupils excluded. Possible increase in referrals. • Current skills not in place to establish primary/Key Stage 3 PRU/Key Stage 4 PRU. • Staff skill set limited to Key Stage/phase teaching. • Increased costs attached multi-agency team(s). • Resources not available to enable multi-agency support for all PRUS- pupils disengaged from learning longer than necessary. • LA managing 3 PRU provisions rather than current 1-is there capacity to achieve this to ensure rigorous monitoring of provisions and increase in expectations.
Timescale	Phased. Primary – Autumn 2011 Key Stage 3-4 Spring 2012 Multi-agency team dependant on reorganising multi-disciplinary teams within Warwickshire.

MODEL 4 - AREA PRUS AT EACH KEY STAGE	
Primary	3 primary PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas.
Key Stage 3	3 Key Stage 3 PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas.
Key Stage 4	3 Key Stage 4 PRUs /intervention service for proposed 3 areas.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils travelling less and staying in own locality, which may enable increased support from parents. • Clearer Leadership and management focus over 1 Key Stage/phase and development of staffs specific skills in a small setting, should impact on improved provision. • Increased accountability for separate Key Stage provision, easier for LA to hold smaller PRU provision to account. • Pupils not associate/pick up on bad role models of older pupils. • Clear focus on intervention /linked to host school with potential increased number returning to own school.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant increased costs leadership and Management. • Increased costs running 9 smaller sites/duplication of resources /staffing. • Possible lack of appropriate accommodation. • Possible lack of skilled staff to set up centers. • LA managing 9 rather than current 1, is there the capacity to do this and ensure rigorous monitoring and increase in expectations. • Primary numbers do not warrant having 3 centers.(currently 6 pupils). • No mainstream accountability, probably significant rise in referrals due to more provision being made available within each area. • No clear remit transition from primary to secondary fro mainstream provision, continued increase referrals to PRU as pupils unable to cope with increased formality of a secondary setting. • Sufficient representatives to enable the forming of Management Committees for 9 PRUs- impacting of lack of monitoring and accountability for provision.
Timescale	<p>Phased approach starting September 2012- September 2013</p> <p>It would be necessary to retain existing provision possible on 2 sites during transition period.</p>

MODEL 5 - SIGNS OF CHANGE (mainstream co-location)	
Primary	3 primary PRUs/intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas.
Key Stage 3	3 Key Stage 3 PRUs/intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas.
Key Stage 4	3 Key Stage 4 PRUs/intervention attached to host schools in proposed 3 areas.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning to increase partnership mainstream schools. • Pupils included within a mainstream provision, increasing access to specialist facilities. • Leadership and management could in time be part of host school, increased inclusion for pupils. • PRU service benefit from skills set of mainstream colleagues in leadership and management, supporting raising standards in PRU provision. • Suitable premises may exist/minimal capital cost. • Pupils travelling similar distances as currently. • Strategic direction of proposed model is in line with what is seen as more effective practice by other LAs /Government?
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be sufficient Schools who want to host provision. • Host Schools may not have appropriate ethos/skills to develop a successful centre. • Insufficient suitable premises at host schools, impacting on significant capital costs to implement model. • Significant capital cost providing suitable premises- increasing costs for PRU provision. • Time required to successfully implement model longer than other proposed models.(negotiating sites/preparing, training staff/ governors. • Effectiveness of transition across Key Stages still remains for vulnerable mainstream pupils, impacting on increased exclusions at secondary. • Sufficient LA manpower to support leading major changes to provision/ and ensure effective monitoring and high expectations.
Timescale	<p>Phased approach starting September 2012- September 2013 It would be necessary to retain existing provision possible on 2 sites during transition period.</p>

MODEL 6 - MULTI INCLUSION CENTRES IN MAINSTREAM PROVISION / 1 Key Stage 4 PRU

Primary	In school support referred primary pupils. Intervention support pupils stay in mainstream provision.
Key Stage 3	Increase number of Learning Support Units as part of secondary school provision, clear focus on intervention / with re-integration clear expectation.
Key Stage 4	Increase number of Learning Support Units centre as part of each secondary school/ with re-integration clear expectation.(in areas high exclusion rates) 1 Key Stage 4 PRU
Benefits Primary Key Stage 3 / 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All pupils stay in mainstream and access appropriate curriculum/support +. • More pupils remain in locality and stays on school role. • Schools increasingly responsible/accountable. • Financial saving on transport. • Potential for school to manage moves to another provision within area. • Able to commission alternative provision where appropriate. • Pupils access to appropriate facilities/curriculum /staff specialism. • Fewer referrals to Key Stage 4- as preventative approaches take effect. • Stronger leadership and management skills of mainstream staff –with a better understanding of expectations to ensure centre led and managed appropriately. • KS4 PRU provision- targeted on extreme pupils, smaller numbers – access support range of external providers to match individual need as appropriate. • Existing site available for PRU Key Stage 4.
Risks Primary Key Stage 3 / 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools not able to cope with extreme pupils in primary , pupils excluded +. • All schools may not want to host provision. • Host Schools may not have appropriate ethos/skills to develop a successful centre. • Potential increase in number of excluded pupils as model established. • Effectiveness of transition across Key Stages still remains for vulnerable mainstream pupils, impacting on increased exclusions at secondary. • Increase costs to out of borough placements. • Insufficient suitable premises at host schools. • Significant costs to ensuring appropriate accommodation. • Time required to successfully implement model. • Sufficient LA manpower to support leading major changes to provision? • 1 Key Stage 4 PRU – pupils travelling longer distances.
Timescale	Phased approach starting Spring 2012- September 2013 Key Stage 4 PRU- Spring 2012

	It would be necessary to retain existing provision for Key Stage 3 possible on 2 sites during transition period.
--	--

MODEL 7 - HYBRID MODEL 1 - INTERVENTIONS + TRANSITION+ PARTNERSHIPS

<p>Primary</p>	<p>In school support/interventions as a far as possible Out of county for extreme pupils Transition PRU for Year 6 (designed to stop pupils failing in secondary school)</p>
<p>Key Stage 3</p>	<p>Key Stage 3 Intervention Centers in those areas with moderate to high exclusion rates./Support for Key Stage 4 transition</p>
<p>Key Stage 4</p>	<p>KS4 PRU / partnerships with college(s) Including possible link to Studio School development attached to a Warwickshire college)*</p>
<p>Benefits Primary</p> <p>Key Stage 3</p> <p>Key Stage 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number pupils remain in mainstream setting and receive appropriate interventions to ensure re-engaged in learning. • Primary schools increase skills to re-engage learners/arrange managed moves where appropriate. • Extreme pupils are provided for appropriately. • Transition PRU Year 6 support pupils to effectively make transition to mainstream secondary and succeed in engaging fully./ decrease exclusions. • Targeted areas for Intervention Centers impact on decrease in permanent exclusions and higher levels of engagement by those at risk of exclusion. Already models in place within county to share effective practice. Able to arrange managed moves as appropriate. Fewer Key Stage 4 referrals to PRU in over time. • Schools take increasing ownership and develop expertise to meeting need of high risk pupils. • Transition to Key Stage 4 – allowing for increased levels of continuity of support for targeted pupils to ensure engaging successfully at Key Stage 4. Able to put in interventions/ meet high levels pastoral support. • KS4 PRU provision- targeted on extreme pupils, smaller numbers – access support range of external providers to match individual need as appropriate. Pupils experience college provision (fully supported)easing transition into Post 16 education. • College provision recognized by Ofsted as outstanding and would be able to support on developing a vision and programme requirements to match pupils needs. College expertise in ensuring accreditation for Key Skills as well as vocational aspects. • Existing site available for PRU Key Stage 4. • Opportunity to appoint a Head Key Stage 4 PRU with strong leadership skills and effective experiences of working in partnerships with colleges/other providers.
<p>Risks Primary</p> <p>Key Stage 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff skills developed quickly enough to meet the challenging behaviour needs in school. • High costs of out of borough placements for primary remain same. • Ensuring appropriate expertise to lead and develop transition PRU. • Schools wanting in identified areas to have Intervention Center. • No back stop for extreme pupils in county. More extreme pupils at Key Stage 3 excluded, costs remain high for out of borough provision.

- Time to negotiate with staff/develop skills to meet needs of pupils referred.

Key Stage 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Key Stage 4 PRU pupils travelling longer distances. • Appointing effective leader and Manger of Key Stage 4 PRU/ who is effective at partnership work linked to colleges. • High costs of college model partnership –each student personalized pathway. • Sufficient LA manpower to mange changes across Key Stages. • Longer timescale to implement hybrid model.
Timescale	<p>Primary – start September 2011- with Intervention PRU in place for January 2012.</p> <p>Key Stage 3- phased approach dependant on number centers- September 2011-2013(retain Key Stage 3 PRU provision interim period)</p> <p>Key Stage 4 PRU January 2012</p>

- Studio School -small school (200-300 students) catering for 14-19 year olds. on college site. Personalised curriculum – incorporating : Enterprise curriculum, Key Skills, practical learning, real work(students receive re-numeration).

MODEL 8 - HYBRID MODEL 2 – SCHOOL MODEL*	
Primary	Commission primary school partnerships – develop their own model to suit need of localities.
Key Stage 3	Commission Secondary schools partnerships develop their own model to suit needs of locality for Key Stage 3.
Key Stage 4	Commission Secondary schools partnerships develop their own model to suit needs of localities Key Stage 4.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools take ownership and responsibility for pupils in their school. • Partnerships plan personalised solutions to their group of students causing concern/able to work with private providers /colleges to meet needs of individual student. • More staff long term skilled in meeting needs of pupils at risk of exclusion. • Staff able to share /keep updated in an effective practice as part of mainstream setting. • Pupils attending in locality/ no transport issues. • Pupils have full access to appropriate facilities/curriculum. • Potential for managed moves within partnerships. • Potentially significant decrease in exclusions.
Risks	<p>Schools cannot set up PRUs without Secretary of State permission- so commissioning would only provide for intervention work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools currently will have a number of priorities /unknowns with anticipated Government changes and may not have capacity to develop/ or want to develop partnership provision. • Appropriate facilities/premises not available. • Significant increased costs to ensuring suitable facilities. • Necessary Skill sets/knowledge and understanding of current staff in mainstream settings not yet in place. • Potential increase in exclusions -no back stop for extreme pupils excluded. • Increase in out of borough placements and costs attached.
Timescale	<p>Phased approach: Primary- September 2012. Secondary September 2012- September 2013.</p>

***Legally Local Authorities retain responsibility for excluded pupils. They remain responsible for providing suitable education and for the quality of the education.**

A group of schools can set up a jointly owned unit , which is a pupil referral unit. (Education Act 2002) but must be approved by Secretary of State , who must be satisfied that the project is innovative.