

## **APPENDIX 1 – Factors to be considered by Decision Makers**

4.16 The following factors **should not** be taken to be exhaustive. Their importance will vary, depending on the type and circumstances of the proposals. All proposals **should** be considered on their individual merits.

### **EFFECT ON STANDARDS AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

#### **A System Shaped by Parents** (Paragraphs 4.17-4.18)

4.17 The Government's aim, as set out in the Five Year Strategy for Education and Learners and the Schools White Paper Higher Standards, Better Schools For All, is to create a schools system shaped by parents which delivers excellence and equity. In particular, the Government wishes to see a dynamic system in which:

- weak schools that need to be closed are closed quickly and replaced by new ones where necessary; and
- the best schools are able to expand and spread their ethos and success.

4.18 The EIA 2006 amends the Education Act 1996 to place duties on LAs to secure diversity in the provision of schools and to increase opportunities for parental choice when planning the provision of schools in their areas. In addition, LAs are under a specific duty to respond to representations from parents about the provision of schools, including requests to establish new schools or make changes to existing schools. The Government's aim is to secure a more diverse and dynamic schools system which is shaped by parents. The Decision Maker **should** take into account the extent to which the proposals are consistent with the new duties on LAs.

#### **Standards** (Paragraphs 4.19-4.20)

4.19 The Government wishes to encourage changes to local school provision which will boost standards and opportunities for young people, whilst matching school place supply as closely as possible to pupils' and parents' needs and wishes.

4.20 Decision Makers **should** be satisfied that proposals for a school expansion will contribute to raising local standards of provision, and will lead to improved attainment for children and young people. They **should** pay particular attention to the effects on groups that tend to under-perform including children from certain ethnic groups, children from deprived backgrounds and children in care, with the aim of narrowing attainment gaps.

#### **Diversity** (Paragraphs 4.21-4.23)

4.21 Decision Makers **should** be satisfied that when proposals lead to children (who attend provision recognised by the LA as being reserved for pupils with special educational needs) being displaced, any alternative provision will meet the statutory SEN improvement test (see paragraphs 4.69-4.72).

4.22 The Government's aim is to transform our school system so that every child receives an excellent education – whatever their background and wherever they live. A vital part of the Government's vision is to create a more diverse school system offering excellence and

choice, where each school has a strong ethos and sense of mission and acts as a centre of excellence or specialist provision.

4.23 Decision Makers **should** consider how proposals will contribute to local diversity. They **should** consider the range of schools in the relevant area of the LA and whether the expansion of the school will meet the aspirations of parents, help raise local standards and narrow attainment gaps.

#### **Every Child Matters** (Paragraph 4.24)

4.24 The Decision Maker **should** consider how proposals will help every child and young person achieve their potential in accordance with “Every Child Matters” principles which are: to be healthy; stay safe; enjoy and achieve; make a positive contribution to the community and society; and achieve economic well-being. This **should** include considering how the school will provide a wide range of extended services, opportunities for personal development, access to academic and applied learning training, measures to address barriers to participation and support for children and young people with particular needs, e.g. looked after children or children with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities.

### **SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS**

#### **Boarding Provision** (Paragraphs 4.25-4.26)

4.25 In making a decision on proposals that include the expansion of boarding provision, the Decision Maker **should** consider whether or not there would be a detrimental effect on the sustainability of boarding at another state maintained boarding school within one hour’s travelling distance of the proposed school.

4.26 In making a decision on proposals for expansion of boarding places the Decision Maker **should** consider:-

- a. the extent to which boarding places are over subscribed at the school and any state maintained boarding school within an hour’s travelling distance of the school at which the expansion is proposed;
- b. the extent to which the accommodation at the school can provide additional boarding places;
- c. any recommendations made in the previous CSCI/Ofsted reports which would suggest that existing boarding provision in the school failed significantly to meet the National Minimum Standards for Boarding Schools;
- d. the extent to which the school has made appropriate provision to admit other categories of pupils other than those for which it currently caters (e.g. taking pupils of the opposite sex or sixth formers) if they form part of the expansion;
- e. any impact of the expansion on the continuity of education of boarders currently in the school;

- f. the extent to which the expansion of boarding places will help placements of pupils with an identified boarding need; and
- g. the impact of the expansion on a state maintained boarding school within one hour's travelling distance from the school which may be undersubscribed.

### **Equal Opportunity Issues** (Paragraphs 4.27)

4.27 The Decision Maker **should** consider whether there are any sex, race or disability discrimination issues that arise from the changes being proposed, for example, that where there is a proposed change to single sex provision in an area, there is equal access to single sex provision for the other sex to meet parental demand. Similarly there needs to be a commitment to provide access to a range of opportunities which reflect the ethnic and cultural mix of the area, while ensuring that such opportunities are open to all.

### **NEED FOR PLACES**

#### **Creating Additional Places** (Paragraphs 4.28-4.30)

4.28 The Decision Maker **should** consider whether there is a need for the expansion and **should** consider the evidence presented for the expansion such as planned housing development or demand for provision. The Decision Maker **should** take into account not only the existence of spare capacity in neighbouring schools, but also the quality and popularity with parents of the schools in which spare capacity exists and evidence of parents' aspirations for places in the school proposed for expansion. The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less popular or successful schools **should not** in itself prevent the addition of new places.

4.29 Where the school has a religious character, or follows a particular philosophy, the Decision Maker **should** be satisfied that there is satisfactory evidence of sufficient demand for places for the expanded school to be sustainable.

4.30 Where proposals will add to surplus capacity but there is a strong case for approval on parental preference and standards grounds, the presumption **should** be for approval. The LA in these cases will need to consider parallel action to remove the surplus capacity thereby created.

#### **Expansion of Successful and Popular Schools** (Paragraph 4.31-4.34)

4.31 The Government is committed to ensuring that every parent can choose an excellent school for their child. We have made clear that the wishes of parents **should** be taken into account in planning and managing school estates. Places **should** be allocated where parents want them, and as such, it **should** be easier for successful and popular primary and secondary schools to grow to meet parental demand. For the purposes of this guidance, the Secretary of State is not proposing any single definition of a successful and popular school. It is for the Decision Maker to decide whether a school is successful and popular, however, the following indicators **should** all be taken into account:

- a. the school's performance;
  - i. in terms of absolute results in key stage assessments and public examinations;
  - ii. by comparison with other schools in similar circumstances (both in the same LA and other LAs);
  - iii. in terms of value added;
  - iv. in terms of improvement over time in key stage results and public examinations.
- b. the numbers of applications for places;
  - i. the Decision Maker should also take account of any other relevant evidence put forward by schools.

4.32 The strong presumption is that proposals to expand successful and popular schools **should** be approved. In line with the Government's long standing policy that there **should** be no increase in selection by academic ability, this presumption does not apply to grammar schools or to proposals for the expansion of selective places at partially selective schools.

4.33 The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less popular schools **should not** in itself be sufficient to prevent this expansion, but if appropriate, in the light of local concerns, the Decision Maker **should** ask the LA how they plan to tackle any consequences for other schools. The Decision Maker **should** only turn down proposals for successful and popular schools to expand if there is compelling objective evidence that expansion would have a damaging effect on standards overall in an area, which cannot be avoided by LA action.

4.34 Before approving proposals the Decision Maker **should** confirm that the admission arrangements of schools proposed for expansion fully meet the provisions of the School Admissions Code. Although the Decision Maker may not modify proposed admission arrangements, the proposer **should** be informed that proposals with unsatisfactory admission arrangements are unlikely to be approved, and given the opportunity to revise them in line with the Code of Practice. Where the LA, rather than the governing body, is the admissions authority, we will expect the authority to take action to bring the admission arrangements in to line with the School Admissions Code.

#### **Travel and Accessibility for All** (Paragraphs 4.35-4.36)

4.35 In considering proposals for the reorganisation of schools, Decision Makers **should** satisfy themselves that accessibility planning has been properly taken into account. Facilities are to be accessible by those concerned, by being located close to those who will use them, and the proposed changes **should not** adversely impact on disadvantaged groups.

4.36 In deciding statutory proposals, the Decision Maker **should** bear in mind that proposals **should not** have the effect of unreasonably extending journey times or increasing

transport costs, or result in too many children being prevented from travelling sustainably due to unsuitable routes e.g. for walking, cycling etc. The EIA 2006 provides extended free transport rights for low income groups – see Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance ref 00373 – 2007BKT-EN at [www.teachernet.gov.uk/publications](http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/publications). Proposals **should** also be considered on the basis of how they will support and contribute to the LA's duty to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport to school.

#### **16-19 Provision** (Paragraphs 4.37-4.39)

4.37 The pattern of 16-19 provision differs across the country. Many different configurations of school and college provision deliver effective 14-19 education and training. An effective 14-19 organisation has a number of key features:

- standards and quality: the provision available **should** be of a high standard – as demonstrated by high levels of achievement and good completion rates;
- progression: there **should** be good progression routes for all learners in the area, so that every young person has a choice of the full range of options within the 14-19 entitlement, with institutions collaborating as necessary to make this offer. All routes **should** make provision for the pastoral, management and learning needs of the 14-19 age group;
- participation: there are high levels of participation in the local area; and,
- learner satisfaction: young people consider that there is provision for their varied needs, aspirations and aptitudes in a range of settings across the area.

4.38 Where standards and participation rates are variable, or where there is little choice, meaning that opportunity at 16 relies on where a young person went to school, the case for reorganisation, or allowing high quality providers to expand, is strong.

4.39 Where standards and participation rates are consistently high, collaboration is strong and learners express satisfaction that they have sufficient choice, the case for a different pattern of provision is less strong. The Decision Maker therefore will need to take account of the pattern of 16-19 provision in the area and the implications of approving new provision.

#### **Addition of post-16 provision by “high performing” schools** (Paragraphs 4.40-4.51)

4.40 The Government remains committed to the principle that high performing 11-16 schools **should** be allowed to add post-16 provision where there is parental and student demand, in order to extend quality and choice. But the context in which this principle will operate is changing. From April 2010, the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 will transfer the responsibility for 16-19 planning and funding from the LSC to LAs. LAs will be responsible for maintaining an effective and coherent system of 14-19 organisation which delivers the new entitlement – to a new curriculum and new qualifications, including all 17 Diploma lines from 2013 and an Apprenticeship place for those who meet the entry criteria - to all young people in their area. Collaboration will be a key feature of 14-19 provision.

4.41 So, while there is still a strong presumption of approval for proposals from high performing schools, that decision **should** now be informed by additional factors: the need for local collaboration; the viability of existing post-16 providers in the local area; and the improvement of standards at the school that is proposing to add post-16 provision. Only in exceptional circumstances\* would these factors lead Decision Makers not to approve a

proposal. If the Decision Maker were minded not to approve a proposal, he **should** first consider whether modification of the proposal would enable the proposer to comply with these conditions (see paragraph 4.49).

*\* Exceptional circumstances in which the Decision Maker might reject the proposal to add a sixth form to a presumption school would include if there is specific evidence that a new sixth form was of a scale that it would directly affect the viability of another neighbouring, high quality institution that itself was not large in comparison to other institutions of that type. Exceptional circumstances might also include a situation where there are a number of presumption schools in the same area at the same time and/or where there is clear evidence that the scale of the aggregate number of additional 16-18 places far exceeds local need and affordability and is therefore clearly poor value for money.*

4.42 There **should** be a strong presumption in favour of the approval of proposals for a new post-16 provision where:

- a. the school is a high performing specialist school that has opted for an applied learning specialism; or
- b. the school, whether specialist or not, meets the DCSF criteria for 'high performing' and does not require capital support.

4.43 The school **should** ensure that, in forwarding its proposals to the Decision Maker, it provides evidence that it meets one of the criteria at paragraph 4.42 above.

4.44 Where a new sixth form is proposed by a specialist school that has met the 'high performing' criteria and which has opted for an applied learning specialism, capital funding may be available from the 16-19 Capital Fund.

4.45 This presumption will apply to proposals submitted to the Decision Maker within:

- a. two years from the date a school commences operation with applied learning specialist school status; or
- b. two years from the date a school is informed of its Ofsted Section 5 inspection results which would satisfy DCSF criteria for 'high performing' status as set out at <http://www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/specialistschools/guidance2007/?version=1>

NOTE: 'submitted to the Decision Maker' above refers to when proposals and representations are with the Decision Maker, following the end of the representation period.

4.46 The increase in the period in which a school is eligible to expand its post-16 provision recognises the time required to embed the new presumption places within a local 14-19 delivery plan and for effective collaboration to take place.

4.47 New post-16 provision in schools **should**, as appropriate, operate in partnership with other local providers to ensure that young people have access to a wide range of learning opportunities. In assessing proposals from 'high performing' schools to add post-16 provision, Decision Makers **should** look for:

- a. evidence of local collaboration in drawing up the presumption proposal; and

- b. a statement of how the new places will fit within the 14-19 organisation in an area; and
- c. evidence that the exercise of the presumption is intended to lead to higher standards and better progression routes at the 'presumption' school.

4.48 If a school has acted in a collaborative way and has actively attempted to engage other partners in the local area, but it is clear that other institutions have declined to participate, that fact **should not** be a reason for declining to approve a proposal. The onus is on other providers to work with a school which qualifies for the presumption of approval for new post-16 provision.

4.49 The Decision Maker **should** only turn down proposals to add post-16 provision from schools eligible for the sixth form presumption if there is compelling and objective evidence that the expansion would undermine the viability of an existing high quality post-16 provider or providers. The fact that an existing school or college with large numbers of post-16 students might recruit a smaller number of students aged 16-19 is not, of itself, sufficient to meet this condition, where the "presumption" school can show that there is reasonable demand from students to attend the school after age 16.

4.50 The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring schools or colleges that are not high performing **should not** be a reason to reject a post-16 presumption proposal. It is the responsibility of the LA to consider decommissioning poor quality provision as well as commissioning high quality provision. The LA should therefore plan to tackle any consequences of expansion proposals for other schools.

4.51 Before approving proposals the Decision Maker **should** confirm that the admission arrangements of schools proposed for expansion fully meet the provisions of the mandatory Schools Admissions Code. Although the Decision Maker may not modify proposed admission arrangements, the proposer **should** be informed that proposals with unsatisfactory admission arrangements are unlikely to be approved, and given the opportunity to revise them in line with the Code. Where the LA, rather than the governing body, is the admissions authority, we will expect the authority to take action to bring the admission arrangements into line with the School Admissions Code.

### **Conflicting Sixth Form Reorganisation Proposals (Paragraph 4.52)**

4.52 Where the implementation of reorganisation proposals by the LSC<sup>1</sup> conflict with other published proposals put to the Decision Maker for decision, the Decision Maker is prevented (by the School Organisation Proposals by the LSC for England Regulations 2003) from making a decision on the "related" proposals until the Secretary of State has decided the LSC proposals (see paragraphs 4.13 to 4.14 above).

### **16-19 Provision 'Competitions' (Paragraphs 4.53-4.56)**

---

<sup>1</sup> References throughout this document to the LSC only apply up to April 2010. The ASCL Act 2009 will transfer the responsibilities of the LSC in respect of 16-19 education and training to LAs, supported by the Young People's Learning Agency. This guidance will be revised by April 2010 to take account of these changes.

4.53 Non-statutory competitions for new 16-19 provision were introduced from January 2006. They are administered by the regional arm of the LSC, in line with the LSC's current role as commissioner of 16-19 provision. The Government intends to transfer the responsibility for 16-19 provision from the LSC to LAs from 2010.<sup>2</sup>

4.54 The current arrangements for the establishment of new institutions by competition involves a two-stage approval process:

- a. the competition selection process;
- b. approval of the outcome by existing processes (e.g. Decision Maker approval of school/LA proposals and Secretary of State approval of college/LSC proposals, as required by law).

4.55 Competitors will be eligible to apply to the 16-19 Capital Fund. Where a competition is 'won' by a school, they **must** then publish statutory proposals and these **must** be considered by the Decision Maker on their merits.

4.56 Where proposals to establish sixth forms are received, and the local LSC is running a 16-19 competition, the Decision Maker **must** take account of the competition when considering the proposals.

## FUNDING AND LAND

### Capital (Paragraphs 4.57-4.59)

4.57 The Decision Maker **should** be satisfied that any land, premises or capital required to implement the proposals will be available. Normally, this will be some form of written confirmation from the source of funding on which the promoters rely (e.g. the LA, DCSF, or LSC). In the case of an LA, this **should** be from an authorised person within the LA, and provide detailed information on the funding, provision of land and premises etc.

4.58 Where proposers are relying on DCSF as a source of capital funding, there can be no assumption that the approval of proposals will trigger the release of capital funds from the Department, unless the Department has previously confirmed in writing that such resources will be available; nor can any allocation 'in principle' be increased. In such circumstances the proposals **should** be rejected, or consideration of them deferred until it is clear that the capital necessary to implement the proposals will be provided.

4.59 Proposals **should not** be approved conditionally upon funding being made available, subject to the following specific exceptions: For proposals being funded under the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) or through the BSF programme, the Decision Maker **should** be satisfied that funding has been agreed 'in principle', but the proposals **should** be approved conditionally on the entering into of the necessary agreements and the release of funding. A conditional approval will protect proposers so that they are not under a statutory duty to

---

<sup>2</sup> The ASCL Act will remove the LSC and also the power of LAs to establish sixth form schools, whether by a competition or otherwise. Section 126 of the Act amends section 16 of the Education Act 1996 and sections 7, 10 and 11 of EIA 2006.



implement the proposals until the relevant contracts have been signed and/or funding is finally released.

### **Capital Receipts** (Paragraphs 4.60-4.62)

4.60 Where the implementation of proposals may depend on capital receipts from the disposal of land used for the purposes of a school (i.e. including one proposed for closure in “related” proposals) the Decision Maker **should** confirm whether consent to the disposal of land is required, or an agreement is needed, for disposal of the land. Current requirements are:

a. Community Schools – the Secretary of State’s consent is required under paragraph 2 of Schedule 35A to the Education Act 1996 and, in the case of playing field land, under section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 (SSFA 1998). (Details are given in DCSF Guidance 1017-2004 “The Protection of School Playing Fields and Land for Academies” published in November 2004) -

<http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=productdetails&PageMode=spectrum&ProductId=DfE-1017-2004&>).

b. Foundation (including Trust) and Voluntary Schools:

i. playing field land – the governing body, foundation body or trustees will require the Secretary of State’s consent, under section 77 of the SSFA 1998, to dispose, or change the use of any playing field land that has been acquired and/or enhanced at public expense.

ii. non-playing field land or school buildings – the governing body, foundation body or trustees no longer require the Secretary of State’s consent to dispose of surplus non-playing field land or school buildings which have been acquired or enhanced in value by public funding. They will be required to notify the LA and seek local agreement of their proposals. Where there is no local agreement, the matter **should** be referred to the Schools Adjudicator to determine. (Details of the new arrangements can be found in the Department’s guidance “The Transfer and Disposal of School Land in England: A General Guide for Schools, Local Authorities and the Adjudicator” -

<http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=productdetails&PageMode=spectrum&ProductId=DfE-1017-2004&> ).

4.61 Where expansion proposals are dependent upon capital receipts of a discontinuing foundation or voluntary school the governing body is required to apply to the Secretary of State to exercise his various powers in respect of land held by them for the purposes of the school. Normally he would direct that the land be returned to the LA but he could direct that the land be transferred to the governing body of another maintained school (or the temporary governing body of a new school). Where the governing body fails to make such an application to the Secretary of State, and the school subsequently closes, all land held by them for the purposes of the discontinued school will, on dissolution of the governing body, transfer to the LA unless the Secretary of State has directed otherwise before the date of dissolution.

4.62 Where consent to the disposal of land is required, but has not been obtained, the Decision Maker **should** consider issuing a conditional approval for the statutory proposals so that the proposals gain full approval automatically when consent to the disposal is obtained (see paragraph 4.75).

**New Site or Playing Fields** (Paragraph 4.63)

4.63 Proposals dependent on the acquisition of an additional site or playing field may not receive full approval but **should** be approved conditionally upon the acquisition of a site or playing field.

**Land Tenure Arrangements** (Paragraph 4.64)

4.64 For the expansion of voluntary or foundation schools it is desirable that a trust, or the governing body if there is no foundation, holds the freehold interest in any additional site that is required for the expansion. Where the trustees of the voluntary or foundation school hold, or will hold, a leasehold interest in the additional site, the Decision Maker will need to be assured that the arrangements provide sufficient security for the school. In particular the leasehold interest **should** be for a substantial period – normally at least 50 years – and avoid clauses which would allow the leaseholder to evict the school before the termination of the lease. The Decision Maker **should** also be satisfied that a lease does not contain provisions which would obstruct the governing body or the headteacher in the exercise of their functions under the Education Acts, or place indirect pressures upon the funding bodies.

**School Playing Fields** (Paragraph 4.65)

4.65 The Education (School Premises) Regulations 1999 set out the standards for school premises, including minimum areas of team game playing fields to which schools **should** have access. The Decision Maker will need to be satisfied that either:

- a. the premises will meet minimum requirements of The Education (School Premises) Regulations 1999; or
- b. if the premises do not meet those requirements, the proposers have secured the Secretary of State's agreement in principle to grant a relaxation.

Where the Secretary of State has given 'in principle' agreement as at paragraph 4.60(b) above, the Decision Maker **should** consider issuing conditional approval so that when the Secretary of State gives his agreement, the proposals will automatically gain full approval.

## **SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN) PROVISION**

### **Initial Considerations** (Paragraphs 4.66-4.67)

4.66 SEN provision, in the context of School Organisation legislation and this guidance, is provision recognised by the LA as specifically reserved for pupils with special educational needs. When reviewing SEN provision, planning or commissioning alternative types of SEN provision or considering proposals for change LAs **should** aim for a flexible range of provision and support that can respond to the special educational needs of individual pupils and parental preferences, rather than necessarily establishing broad categories of provision according to special educational need or disability. There are a number of initial considerations for LAs to take account of in relation to proposals for change. They **should** ensure that local proposals:

- a. take account of parental preferences for particular styles of provision or education settings;
- b. offer a range of provision to respond to the needs of individual children and young people, taking account of collaborative arrangements (including between special and mainstream), extended school and Children's Centre provision; regional centres (of expertise ) and regional and sub-regional provision; out of LA day and residential special provision;
- c. are consistent with the LA's Children and Young People's Plan;
- d. take full account of educational considerations, in particular the need to ensure a broad and balanced curriculum, including the National Curriculum, within a learning environment in which children can be healthy and stay safe;
- e. support the LA's strategy for making schools and settings more accessible to disabled children and young people and their scheme for promoting equality of opportunity for disabled people;
- f. provide access to appropriately trained staff and access to specialist support and advice, so that individual pupils can have the fullest possible opportunities to make progress in their learning and participate in their school and community;
- g. ensure appropriate provision for 14-19 year-olds, taking account of the role of local LSC funded institutions and their admissions policies; and
- h. ensure that appropriate full-time education will be available to all displaced pupils. Their statements of special educational needs will require amendment and all parental rights must be ensured. Other interested partners, such as the Health Authority should be involved.

4.67 Taking account of the considerations, as set out above, will provide assurance to local communities, children and parents that any reorganisation of SEN provision in their area is designed to improve on existing arrangements and enable all children to achieve the five Every Child Matters outcomes.

### **The Special Educational Needs Improvement Test** (Paragraph 4.68)

4.68 When considering any reorganisation of provision that would be recognised by the LA as reserved for pupils with special educational needs, including that which might lead to some children being displaced through closures or alterations, LAs, and all other proposers for new schools or new provision, will need to demonstrate to parents, the local community and Decision Makers how the proposed alternative arrangements are likely to lead to improvements in the standard, quality and/or range of educational provision for children with special educational needs. All consultation documents and reorganisation plans that LAs publish and all relevant documentation LAs and other proposers submit to Decision Makers **should** show how the key factors set out in paragraphs 4.69 to 4.72 below have been taken into account by applying the SEN improvement test. Proposals which do not credibly meet these requirements **should not** be approved and Decision Makers **should** take proper account of parental or independent representations which question the LA's own assessment in this regard.

#### **Key Factors** (Paragraphs 4.69-4.72)

4.69 When LAs are planning changes to their existing SEN provision, and in order to meet the requirement to demonstrate likely improvements in provision, they **should**:

- a. identify the details of the specific educational benefits that will flow from the proposals in terms of:
  - i. improved access to education and associated services including the curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment, with reference to the LA's Accessibility Strategy;
  - ii. improved access to specialist staff, both education and other professionals, including any external support and/or outreach services;
  - iii. improved access to suitable accommodation; and
  - iv. improved supply of suitable places.
- b. LAs **should** also:
  - i. obtain a written statement that offers the opportunity for all providers of existing and proposed provision to set out their views on the changing pattern of provision seeking agreement where possible;
  - ii. clearly state arrangements for alternative provision. A 'hope' or 'intention' to find places elsewhere is not acceptable. Wherever possible, the host or alternative schools should confirm in writing that they are willing to receive pupils, and have or will have all the facilities necessary to provide an appropriate curriculum;
  - iii. specify the transport arrangements that will support appropriate access to the premises by reference to the LA's transport policy for SEN and disabled children; and

- iv. specify how the proposals will be funded and the planned staffing arrangements that will be put in place.

4.70 It is to be noted that any pupils displaced as a result of the closure of a BESD school (difficulties with behavioural, emotional and social development) **should not** be placed long-term or permanently in a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) if a special school place is what they need. PRUs are intended primarily for pupils who have been excluded, although LAs can and do use PRU provision for pupils out of school for other reasons such as illness and teenage pregnancies. There may of course be pupils who have statements identifying that they have BESD who have been placed appropriately in a PRU because they have been excluded; in such cases the statement **must** be amended to name the PRU, but PRUs **should not** be seen as an alternative long-term provision to special schools.

4.71 The requirement to demonstrate improvements and identify the specific educational benefits that flow from proposals for new or altered provision as set out in the key factors are for all those who bring forward proposals for new special schools or for special provision in mainstream schools including governors of foundation schools and foundation special schools. The proposer needs to consider all the factors listed above.

4.72 Decision Makers will need to be satisfied that the evidence with which they are provided shows that LAs and/or other proposers have taken account of the initial considerations and all the key factors in their planning and commissioning in order to meet the requirement to demonstrate that the reorganisation or new provision is likely to result in improvements to SEN provision.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Views of Interested Parties** (Paragraphs 4.73)

4.73 The Decision Maker **should** consider the views of all those affected by the proposals or who have an interest in them including: pupils; families of pupils; staff; other schools and colleges; local residents; diocesan bodies and other providers; LAs; the LSC (where proposals affect 14-19 provision) and the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership if one exists, or any local partnership or group that exists in place of an EYDCP (where proposals affect early years and/or childcare provision). This includes statutory objections and comments submitted during the representation period. The Decision Maker **should not** simply take account of the numbers of people expressing a particular view when considering representations made on proposals. Instead the Decision Maker **should** give the greatest weight to representations from those stakeholders likely to be most directly affected by the proposals.

This page is intentionally left blank