

GOVERNING BODY OF SUFFOLK ONE

PRINCIPAL'S REPORT TO THE GOVERNING BODY REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES TO FOUNDATION LEARNING PROVISION

INDEX		
Section		Page
1.	Purpose	2
2.	Introduction	2
3.	Factual Background	3
4.	Foundation Learning	5
5.	Finance	5
6.	Proposed Curriculum Offer	9
7.	Consultation on the Proposed Curriculum Offer	11
8.	Relevant Statutory Data	13
9.	Summary of Consultation Responses	14
9.1	Survey Monkey	14
9.2	Written Responses	17
9.3	Consultation Meetings	18
9.4	Suffolk County Council	19
10.	Further steps taken by Suffolk One in relation to Consultation	21
11.	Legal Considerations	23
12.	Principal's Recommendation	30

Background Papers	
1.	Rationale for Change
2.	Proposal for Change
3.	List of Consultees
4.	Record of Responses

GOVERNING BODY OF SUFFOLK ONE

PRINCIPAL'S REPORT TO THE GOVERNING BODY REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES TO FOUNDATION LEARNING PROVISION

Foundation Learning: A Proposal for Change

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to bring the Governing Body up to date with proposals for making substantial savings towards eliminating Suffolk One's licensed deficit by rationalising Foundation Learning (FL) provision at Suffolk One, thereby reducing delivery and support costs. Following an earlier proposal to similar effect, it was considered that the Governing Body had insufficient information about the views of those potentially effected and the impact upon them to make a decision upon that proposal. That proposal was therefore not pursued, and a fresh consultation has been held, to inform the present proposals. Legal advice has been taken, and the Principal has also analysed the available information in the light of the public sector equality duty, so the Governing Body can consider the present proposal in the light of its duty to give due regard to the needs to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between members of different groups at the school.

This report sets out in some detail the financial imperatives facing the school which have led to the present proposals being advanced. It also draws the attention of the Governing Body to the responses to the Foundation Learning Consultation which ended on 10th June 2014. It also provides an analysis of the responses taking account of the legal issues which the Governors must consider in reaching a decision as to whether to approve the present proposal to reconfigure FL learning provision at Suffolk One with effect from September 2014.

2. Introduction

The proposal which Governors are asked to consider and, if appropriate, approve is:

- a. To rationalise the way in which the present FL provision is delivered at Suffolk One from September 2014, so that it is delivered over three days instead of, as present, over five. The projected financial saving from this provision is £391,265, consisting of both cuts in teaching and support costs.
- b. To take steps, in discussion with SCC, to negotiate additional sources of funding so that those FL students who need additional help or support to access the School's facilities on other days are able to receive it.

- c. To note that if no such additional sources of funding are forthcoming, FL students will only be able to access School facilities without additional help or support provided by the School on days upon which the FL curriculum is not delivered to them.
- d. Governors will be aware of the documentation used to inform the consultation and for ease these are attached as appendices. Copies of responses from interested parties are also held centrally and have been available for Governors to view since Wednesday 11th June.

3. Factual Background

The South West Ipswich and South Suffolk (SWISS) partnership is a collaboration which formed in 2006. It brought together the two partnerships of South Suffolk and South West Ipswich. This involved the 11-16 schools of Claydon, East Bergholt, Hadleigh, Holbrook, Ormiston Endeavour (previously Thurleston), Stoke, Suffolk New (previously Chantry) and Westbourne and the Special schools of Beacon Hill, The Bridge (previously Belstead) and Thomas Wolsey.

The early work of SWISS focussed on the outcomes of an area wide review of pre and post 16 education in Suffolk which essentially concluded that "post 16 education in this area was no longer fit for purpose and there was a need to build strong local partnerships to support pre 16 provision."

The Local Authority (Suffolk County Council) led the SWISS partnership in a review of the current arrangements and the development of a solution which offered:-

- Breadth and choice.
- Increased post 16 participation.
- High quality learning.
- Value for money.

This led to the development of Suffolk One, a fully accessible and inclusive centre of learning for 16-19 year olds. It provided a unique combination offering a broad range of 'A' levels, a wide range of vocational courses and a comprehensive programme of Foundation Learning (FL) courses. Suffolk One provides a bespoke curriculum for students with the full range of special educational needs from profound multiple learning difficulties to those with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties.

The building was designed with an emphasis on flexible learning and collaboration. It includes specialist facilities, practical areas and breakout zones alongside more formal classroom. The environment is designed to encourage students to develop the range of communication and organisational skills that

ensure they will be equipped to face the challenges of a twenty first century workplace.

Suffolk One opened in September 2010 and replaced the previous sixth form provision based at the then Claydon, Chantry and Westbourne High schools and the sixth form provision which existed at the special schools of Belstead and Thomas Wolsey. These centres ceased offering sixth form provision in July 2010.

The vision was to develop an inclusive and inspirational learning centre which sat at the heart of a collaborative learning community where all talents and achievements were equally valued.

The priorities were to:-

- Significantly increase participation in learning for 16-18 year olds.
- Significantly increase the range of learning options post 16 including for those students with complex Special Educational Needs.
- Raise attainment post 16.
- Provide high quality learning opportunities within a more cost effective and efficient structure.

In terms of student population the following forecast was initially developed:-

Student Population	Year									
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	Baseline	+6%	+3%	+3%	+3%					
Year 12	950	1007	1037	1069	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100
Year 13		856	882	908	936	936	936	936	936	936
Sixth Form	950	1863	1919	1977	2036	2036	2036	2036	2036	2036
14-16	100	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Total	1050	2063	2119	2177	2236	2236	2236	2236	2236	2236
Courses										
A Level	380	745	767	791	814	814	814	814	814	814
Int. Bac.	48	93	96	98	102	102	102	102	102	102
Vocational	427	838	864	890	916	916	916	916	916	916
*SEN (Inc. FL)	95	187	192	198	204	204	204	204	204	204
14- 16	100	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Total	1050	2063	2119	2177	2236	2236	2236	2236	2236	2236

*Includes those students studying on level 2 and 3 programmes with statements of educational need (SEN)- including School Action plus and School Action. In 2013 this figure was in fact 290 (nearly 100 above the planning forecast).

The centre will be close to reaching its target of just over 2000 Post 16 students this September.

4. Foundation Learning (FL) Provision

FL provision at Suffolk One offers students the opportunity to improve their skills, build on qualifications and progress in areas they are interested in. Our specialist facilities and learning environments enable all students to engage, learn and progress together. Our ultimate aim is to develop independent learning and thinking skills in all our students, which will prepare them for the next step such as further education, employment, and supported employment or towards independent living.

In order to realise our commitment to the inclusive nature of our offer which encourages **all** students to develop their social and independent learning and thinking together, Suffolk One is committed to continuing this practice and ethos but can only sustain this over three days as from September 2014.

FL at Suffolk One provides provision for up to 80 students including those on the Continuum through to and including those at Level 1. Our students predominantly come to us from the three special schools in Ipswich; Thomas Wolsey, The Bridge and Beacon Hill.

At the end of the academic year 2009/10, both Thomas Wolsey and the Bridge closed their 5 day a week Post 16 provision as part of the developments associated with the opening of Suffolk One. Beacon Hill did not have provision for post 16 and the majority of students would have attended either Suffolk New College, or Easton & Otley College, where they accessed programmes over 3 days. As a result of the 5 day a week provision being available at Suffolk One Beacon Hill students now make up 65% of our cohort in FL rather than attend those alternative providers. The programme designed and delivered by Suffolk One was provided over a 5 day period and this remains the case up until the end of this academic year.

When the School was founded nothing was agreed with Suffolk County Council about how long 5 day provision would be made for Suffolk One's students, and SCC has acknowledged that fact during recent discussion.

Annual Reviews : We are in continuous dialogue with feeder Special Schools and staff from Suffolk One normally attend student Annual Review meetings along with representation from Suffolk County Council, parents and students.

5. Financial Reasons for the proposed changes

Suffolk One admitted its first cohort of students in September 2010. The financial assumptions that informed the planning of the project indicated that the income generated by student numbers would be sufficient to put the provision into surplus at an early stage. The school did not receive any form of start-up funding in order to support either pre-opening costs or the necessary inefficiencies of delivery prior to the school reaching capacity.

However, policy decisions by Government taken after the school was started and which could not therefore be taken into account when the financial planning was undertaken invalidated these assumptions as funding streams were reduced or withdrawn altogether. The most significant changes over the period since 2010 have been:-

- The reduction in the rate of funding in school 6th forms to that of colleges.
- The removal of funding for enrichment.
- The removal of Teacher Pay Grant.
- The withdrawing of funding uplift for Teacher Pensions.
- The mainstreaming and subsequent freezing of Standards Grants resulting in funding per student falling.
- Withdrawal of funding for 14-16 Diplomas – a key part of the original project.

The following table shows the financial position of the school from opening to the end of the 2013/14 financial year, showing that Suffolk One has been in deficit for each year of operation though with in-year positions improving until 2013/14 when the Education Funding Agency were not able to fund student growth adequately.

Financial Years	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Year 12	684	739	741	1,020
Year 13		402	555	592
Total Roll (September)	684	1,141	1,296	1,612
Opening Balance	-£450,494	£1,091,222	£1,536,359	-£1,814,668
Income	£4,321,339	£7,749,952	£8,794,891	£9,126,636
Expenditure	-£4,962,067	£8,195,089	£9,073,200	-£9,912,622
Outturn	-£640,728	-£445,137	-£278,309	-£785,986
Closing Balance	-£1,091,222	£1,536,359	£1,814,668	-£2,600,654

The scale of enrolments for the first three years had been lower than that originally planned but the intake to Year 12 in September 2013 was very close to the original forecasts.

Suffolk One's response to the changing picture of funding has been to seek to make savings in such a way as to minimise the impact on the quality of the outcomes for students while maintaining the offer of education to young people and their families in Suffolk. All areas of provision have been examined and efficiencies made, for example: -

- The curriculum offer is reviewed annually, with student demand, academic performance and cost taken into consideration. This has resulted in the withdrawal of the Level 3 Extended Diploma in Construction, the A Levels in Law, Religious Studies and Information Technology and the AS Level in Critical Thinking. This has resulted in savings of in excess of **£125,000** per annum in direct teaching costs alone.
- The school had designed an enrichment programme ('Evolve') which occupied Wednesday afternoons in the first academic year of operation. This, in parallel with the less formal 'Engage' programme, was intended to offer Level 2 and 3 students five day's learning-related activity. It became clear almost immediately that financial imperatives mean that this would have to cease. Evolve occupied 47 timetabled periods of teaching time in the first year and its cancellation reduced costs by approximately **£230,000**.
- The Senior Leadership Team has been restructured with the loss of two Directors of Learning with a resultant annual saving to the school budget of **£129,000**.

Total savings of £484,000 in salary costs alone.

Savings have also been achieved in the cost of utilities with costs falling in absolute terms despite increases in the occupancy of the building and rises in energy prices per unit.

For the academic year 2014-15 Suffolk One plans to make efficiencies on Level 2 and 3 programmes by raising average group sizes across the school by in excess of 15%. While this will put extra demands on teachers and students the costs foregone will be in the region of **£125,000**.

The proposed re-structuring of FL would make an intended saving of c.£400,000. A saving of this large scale could be made most equitably by focusing the taught provision in FL over 3 days. Other ways in which this saving could be achieved have been considered.

An example of such an alternative would have been to remove a discrete part of our curriculum, such as Engineering and Motor Vehicle. This was not considered a viable option as there is sustained growth in these areas and they meet both local and national skill shortages. Equally, it was apparent that the closure of such a discrete area of the school would not make sufficient savings.

For September 2014-2015, the school is projecting the following student enrolments

Course	Projected Numbers
L3 Engineering – Year 12	33
L3 Engineering – Year 13	41
L2 Motor Vehicle – Year 12	18
L3 – Motor Vehicle – Year 13	15
Total	107

Overall, the withdrawal of these courses would have led to the rejection by the school of 107 projected enrolments. This represents a loss of potentially £533,414 in EFA learner funding, with each student factored at £4,985 per capita. In addition these students would have attracted £61,729 being their share of support funding and other school income giving a total income attributable to this provision of **£595,143**.

This loss in revenue would be offset by the reduction in salary costs if the whole Engineering and Motor Vehicle team were made compulsorily redundant totalling £233,905 plus further staff costs to the total of £151,662 (being these courses contribution to support staff, leadership costs, administrative staffing and indirect staff costs). Resource budgets would also be reduced by £21,560 through and the contribution to other expenditure from this provision would be reduced by £82,645 giving a total notional saving of **£489,772**.

In conclusion to this example, over 100 projected learners would have lost the chance for full time education in a specialist, highly employable area that meets local needs and their interests. Up to 5 full time teachers would have been made redundant, as would 1.5 technicians, while an annual contract with one teaching consultant would not have required renewal. The final outcome of this substantial change would be a net loss of income of **£105,371**.

This serves as a good example of how we have tested each area of curriculum in the school and are able to demonstrate that with projected growth in numbers all provision is financially viable.

There are different, and additional funding streams for students with special educational needs such as those on the FL programme. However, these do not cover Suffolk One's actual costs of making provision for these students as currently arranged and timetabled.

Funding for learning, whether within FL or for students on Level 2 or 3 programmes is delivered by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) through their national formula reflecting prior delivery through using the prior year's census ("lagged funding"). The EFA also provides funding for additional educational need based upon demand recorded by Local Authorities (this year) and through data returns (from next year). This element is only applicable to those on Level 2 and 3 courses. These students may also attract small values of top-up funding from the Local Authority subject to an audit of their support needs.

Suffolk One receives a small element of delegated budget from the Authority being the legacy of the decision to cease Standards Grants as distinct funding elements.

The delivery of FL courses is supported by funding from the Authority's High Needs budget. This has two elements. One element is commissioned place funding (a per capita figure for each place, whether or not it is taken up); the second is a significant top up element intended to – but not in fact covering – the specific costs of each commissioned place taken up, depending upon the needs of the student occupying it. The current value of this funding was reached in 2012/13 and has not changed materially since then.

Suffolk One has not been able to access other sources of funding to support the delivery of FL courses as other agencies will only be able to deliver funding against provision that is seen as new. Suffolk One is of course unable to make a charge for the delivery of education compatibly with the terms of its funding agreement, and in any event, would regard it as unacceptable to do so.

These pressures mean that Suffolk One has to examine closely the provision it makes for 'funding for learning', to make sure that it is using its available budget as efficiently as possible and (unfortunately) to ensure that it is not funding care provision which is not strictly necessary to enable students to access the efficient delivery of the full-time funding for learning curriculum.

6. Proposed Curriculum offer for FL Students 2014/15 onwards

In the light of these financial pressures, and the inadequate levels of funding, we need to introduce a sustainable model for FL provision for the future. DfE guidance considers that 540 hours of teaching a year amounts to full-time provision. Currently, Suffolk One provides far more than this, and we can generate considerable savings by reducing it. Moreover, for FL students, spreading that timetable over 5 days a week generates considerable support costs to enable such students to be safely present on site, which are not strictly educational needs, and which could be reduced if the timetable were delivered over 3 days a week. These are the pressures which led us to consider changing the timetable of delivery for FL students, and to consult on the present proposal.

We have also looked at the option of making no change but consider such an approach is not financially sustainable. Models that have a mixture of 3 and 4 day delivery were also considered but these represented nearly as great a change whilst still failing to ensure financial viability and sustainability.

Suffolk One have considered a suggestion from parents that is provides 5 half days of provision rather than three full days. This proposal would not meet the required GLH stipulated by the DfE for this provision. Suffolk One would be unable to finance provision for the remaining half days; in addition we believe it is unlikely that SCC would provide transport to meet this curriculum model.

In Suffolk currently it is worth highlighting that there is no other post 16 school based model which offers "5 day" taught provision for Foundation Learning students. Commonly, providers deliver programmes which are no more than 540 Guided Learning Hours and take place over a lesser number of days; such models provide the full entitlement to Functional Skills, Personal, Social and Health education coupled with some vocational options. These establishments have good success rates and there is nothing to suggest that the same will not be the case at Suffolk One.

We put the proposal out to consultation on the basis that learning experience and outcomes are not necessarily enhanced by being in class for a greater number of days. A full 5 day taught programme exceeds the hours funded to meet the requirements of the courses and is not in line with the teaching allocation for Foundation Learning students in similar settings. If the proposal is approved, the number of Guided Learning Hours on each of these days will be the same as on each day now. Outside the classroom Suffolk One will continue to support the students to become part of the wider school community on the days on which they are being taught.

Foundation Learning students will not be prevented from accessing school facilities outside their timetabled teaching sessions, although we recognise that some will need additional support in order to do so and may not, in practical terms, be able to do so in its absence.

If the proposal is adopted, however, it will enable Suffolk One to make significant savings by not employing support staff for those additional days. In order to comply with the legal requirement to balance the budget, savings must come from somewhere, and it is the Principal's judgment that we are unable within the resources available, to meet the costs of additional staffing resources to support any of our students (whether FL, Level 2 or Level 3) at times when it is not necessary for FL students to be on site to access the rationalised (but still full-time) timetabled hours of provision.

The proposal, which formed the basis of consultation and which governors are asked to approve, is that Foundation Learning students will undertake a normal school day on three days of the week with starting and closing times unaffected.

The range and content of the provision we propose to offer will be similar to that which currently exists and will have a clear focus on learning. This is set out in the 'Proposal for Change'.

7. Consultation on the present Proposal for Change

The proposal which the Governing Body is presently asked to approve follows from an earlier, and – in the event identical – proposal. However, it has been the subject of further analysis and has not been advanced again without careful consideration of the responses to a detailed consultation which closed on 10 June 2014.

The background is that in February 2014 Suffolk One communicated with interested parties and issued a document (Appendix A) which set out some of the changes that Suffolk One has experienced in areas such as learning, growth in student numbers, reduced funding levels from national and local government and the use of space and resources since it opened in 2010; outlined several of the changes that have already been introduced across the school to ensure specific areas of work remained financially viable and sustainable into the future and indicated on proposed changes to our Foundation Learning programme. It highlighted concerns about the current programmes of learning and an annual deficit of £0.40 million. It indicated that this deficit could be met by reconfiguring the FL programme in a more cost-effective and sustainable way, which involved reducing the number of days over which the curriculum was delivered, with consequent savings on teaching and support costs.

The document brought a number of responses from concerned parents registering worries about the planned changes for the delivery of the Foundation Learning programme. We met with those parents to listen to and to seek to address their concerns and to seek to guide them about how they might seek local authority support for the two days during which the FL curriculum would not be provided.

On 25th October 2013 we met with Corporate Director of Children and Young Peoples Services of Suffolk County Council setting out our concerns about the viability of our existing provision and outlining our proposals for the future. We again met with the Corporate Director and three Assistant Directors and other officers from the Local Authority on February 27th at Suffolk One. It was agreed to form a sub-group to look at individual families and how best to support them (this meeting took place but no-one from Suffolk One was invited). The Vice-Principal and Assistant Principal at Suffolk One met with 11 colleagues from the Local Authority on 13 March at Endeavour House. There was to be a follow up

meeting when the Assistant Director, at SCC returned from annual leave on 24 April (this meeting was subsequently cancelled by SCC). There are challenges to provide a wide range of options for the students when they are not at Suffolk One but we remained committed to working with the Local Authority to support them in the resolution of these issues.

At the meeting of the Suffolk One Governing Body on 30th April 2014 it was decided that, in view of the responses received, mostly from parents of existing and prospective students, further information was needed to enable the governing body to consider how to proceed. This information was particularly needed to enable the governing body to appreciate the full impact of the proposals on those affected and to consider the relevant legal issues lawfully and rationally.

A further period of consultation therefore took place between 6 May 2014 and 10 June 2014. The list of consultees is set out at Appendix C.

In seeking further views, the Governing Body wanted to ensure that students, parents/carers and the wider community were fully aware and understood the proposals and had the opportunity to put forward their views and ideas. Interested parties were therefore asked to review the content of the proposal and take the opportunity to:-

- Complete the survey form which was available at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TJTV55W>.
- If they preferred, to submit views in writing by post or by handing in comments to the Reception at Suffolk One.
- For parents/ carers, take up the opportunity to meet with the Principal and key members of the Senior Leadership team to help clarify information and put forward their ideas or proposals. These opportunities were scheduled for 13th and 15th May 2014, 4.30 to 8.00pm at Suffolk One.

Following this exercise, interested parties were informed that the Governing Body, at today's meeting, will reflect on the responses that have been received, consider views and ideas that have been submitted and have regard to this detailed impact assessment. At this point the Governing Body will make decisions and plans for the future. These will be communicated to students, parent/ carers and the wider community as soon as possible after 19 June but, if necessary, having allowed time for any supplementary work to be undertaken.

This period of consultation, and conscientious consideration of its outcome, has enabled the Principal to be sure that he has all relevant information and ideas before it before deciding whether to continue to advance the February 2014 proposal, or to make a different one; and enables the governing body to decide whether or not to approve the proposal made to it on a fully informed basis. That consultation exercise closed on 10 June 2014. The individual responses are

not being made public, given the small number of consultees and confidentiality concerns, but individual governors can view them at the school.

This paper synthesises the views expressed

The Principal has considered the views expressed and information obtained from the consultation. He has considered the relevant legal considerations: the understanding of parents when they sought places at the school; the implications of different timetable patterns for FL students and their families; the legal obligation to reach a balanced budget; potential different sources of finance and potential different ways of balancing the budget. The Proposal for Change (Annex B) is his view as to the best option to deliver full curriculum hours on the FL programme, consistently with all these requirements.

Notwithstanding his careful reconsideration of it in the light of consultation responses and the issues highlighted by them, the financial constraints and lack of available alternative options are such that the proposal is the same as that originally advanced in February 2014.

It is important, however, to emphasise that the Governing Body has set aside its earlier decision, and that the decision facing it at the meeting on 19 June 2014 is a fresh one, in the light of consultation responses. The decision for the governing body is whether to approve the present Proposal for Change, in the light of all relevant information and bearing in mind in particular the legal obligations upon them.

What follows sets out a summary of the views that have been received from students, parents/ carers, stakeholders and the wider community. All the responses received have been available for Governors to see since 11 June 2014.

8. Relevant statistical data-

8.1 Foundation Learning Student Numbers at Suffolk One

Year Group	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
12	45	27	30	38
13	-	42	12	22
14	-	-	29	14
Total	45	69	71	74

8.2 Responses to the consultation process.

Nature of Response	Number of responses
Written prior to 6 May 2014	30
Meetings with senior staff prior to 6 May 2014	5
Survey Monkey returns	41
Written from 6 May to 10 June 2014.	23
Parent/ Carer meetings with Principal/ Vice Principal	12
Total	111

Many Parents/ Carers took the opportunity to respond by each of the categories set out above. Therefore, the total number of responses from different parties representing students is 66. These represent the views from parents/carers and other interested parties from across the whole of Suffolk as well as from SCC. It also includes the views of many parents / carers whose children are not at Suffolk One or planning to attend Suffolk One in September 2014, but are currently in primary, high or special schools.

9. Summary of the responses

9.1 "Survey monkey" responses

It is the view of a number of consultees that Suffolk One should honour its original 5 day a week offer and has a moral obligation to do so. A few respondents believe this was a pre- condition of Suffolk One being set up and the 16-19 provision at special schools ceasing. Additionally, it is a school not a college and should not therefore make comparisons with other F.E. colleges. Suffolk One is a 'school' and as such should provide a 5 day week curriculum. Children with learning difficulties and disabilities clearly need more education not less. Suffolk One is well placed to address this issue locally.

Of those that responded, the continuation of a 5 day model was a majority view. Three respondents believed it to be a good proposal, had no issues and liked the ideas suggested within the proposal.

In terms of the 540 hours minimum requirement some respondents stated that the Department of Education, Education Funding Group: Funding Policy Unit, states that:- Mainstream education funding arrangements for young people aged 16-19 are now based on students receiving teaching of about 600 hours per year for a full time course, but the guidance is clear that the actual number of hours for students will and should vary. More importantly, this approach simply does not apply to young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, and

particularly those with statements of special educational needs (SEN) or with learning difficulty assessments, in schools and colleges. These young people should receive whatever additional support they need, and that can cover additional hours or days of teaching as well as other support, and schools and colleges should be funded accordingly.

It is a common view that funding to support these additional needs should come from the Local Authority. This is supported in the DfE Draft Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0-25 years which that local authorities should "consider the need to provide a full package of provision and support across education, health and care- that covers five days a week where that is appropriate to meet the young person's needs and which will equip them for adulthood".

These young people have been undertaking 5 days a week since they started schools and therefore to say they become tired and cannot cope/ concentrate is not correct. Allowing them access to the building but not providing support during this time is considered to be discriminatory. Another view acknowledged that students found it difficult to concentrate and a better option would be to have 5 half day for students. This will allow routine and less time in between learning therefore allowing the student to revisit/revise the subject learnt on previous days.

The current model costs just over £1.7 million each year to deliver. Funding for Foundation Learning is currently totalling over £1.3 million leaving an annual deficit of nearly £0.4 million. This is a short fall of about 20% - that is equivalent reduction in teaching time is 1 day a week.

Respondents emphasised the need for 5 days, with more time for learning and support delivered by skilled practitioners. Some students cope by having a predictable routine within a familiar environment. Going to Suffolk One is not just educational it provides students with an opportunity to have a social aspect to their lives.

There are concerns about the loss of valuable teaching hours and social interaction alongside the structure and learning reinforcement that a five day week provides. It has been suggested that a 3 day a week model does not meet specific Statements of SEN. If the offer of 5 days is diminished it will reduce students' well- being and have an adverse impact on family life.

Some respondents are concerned about what will take place over the 2 days and where this will happen. There seems to be insufficient places already without adding to the demand on these places. How will these placements help with their personal growth and learning objectives? Any such placements would need to address these issues. Students on the autistic spectrum may also find too many

changes within a week too much to deal with and there could be additional behavioural and mental health problems for both students and parents.

There are worries around the reduction in resourcing by social services into adult services leaving our young people vulnerable and dependent on family support. Respondents are also anxious about the financial implications on families and by forcing some to spend nearly half the school week at home they become isolated from peers and teachers making them bored and lonely, and is cruel.

Most of the respondents who offered ideas believe a 5 day a week solution must be found and it must be based on student need. Any solution must meet the requirements of the Statement of Educational Needs.

Some suggest and recognise that this may involve a differing number of days for particular students and offer different activities. These might include youth groups work, community based activities, advocacy and supervision, social and life skills and work experience opportunities. It might include internet cafe groups, social skills groups and parent volunteers to support professionals. It has been suggested that a business type venture such as "Genesis" would be an option and whatever is introduced it should be meaningful, complimentary and should be associated to the student's learning goals and be of use in adult life. Any offer should provide students' with a consistency of expectation and a continued scene of identity at Suffolk One.

In terms of funding this 5 day a week provision, as suggested in the proposal, we should work with the Local Authority to identify joint solutions and it is considered by some that the Local Authority should offer funding to support these placements or additional support. Suffolk One should also look to diversify and attract income from external sources to reinvest in the student community.

It has also been suggested that the Local Authority should eradicate Suffolk One's inherited debt and both organisations should look at creative solutions around how Direct payments might be used to direct funding towards Suffolk One. The Local Authority should also provide the help and support needed by alternative providers.

It has also been suggested that we split the Foundation Learning course into morning and afternoon sessions, which are held on all the 5 days of the week. By this Suffolk One can achieve its target of cost reduction and also ensure that each student attends college daily (some will attend morning sessions, while others will attend afternoon sessions).

Respondents believe there should be liaison between all providers of services. Transport will also need to be carefully considered and provided as part of any package.

There is a view that the situation has been handled poorly, we have been uncaring towards students, have failed to keep parents fully informed and not communicated with them at the highest level. Some respondents consider that we have not considered the needs of students with SEN and focussed on the financial perspective only.

It is considered any solution we offer must be balanced and there is a view that; funding is being disproportionately stripped from the FL courses. All schools subsidise their FL/ SEN provision, it is the reality of Learning Support provision. If there are funding issues then the Local Authority should be approached and asked to explore some cross funding from social care.

Some parents have already raised these issues with legal advisers, the Local Authority and M.P's.

A few have suggested setting up a working group of all stakeholders with a significant parental input. Their role would be to look at the consultation outcomes, carry out an impact assessment and deliver real solutions to the challenge posed to Suffolk One and the Local Authority.

9.2 Summary of written responses

Parents expressed their concern and opposition to the proposed model emphasising that assurances were given to parents around the provision of a 5 day model when Suffolk One opened in 2010. The closure of the previous post 16 provision in local special schools would not have been allowed had it been suggested that anything less than 5 days would take place at Suffolk One. It is a 5 day model that is required and only this will meet students' statements of need. This earlier commitment should be honoured. Suffolk One should offer inclusive not exclusive education. These proposals are deemed to be discriminatory.

Parents also highlighted the lack of alternative activities which currently exists and might be used for the 2 days to enhance the 3 days proposal at Suffolk One. The comments again questioned the number of hours that should be made available and quoted the 600 hours referred to earlier in this report alongside the need for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities to have additional support, consistency in routine and continuous reinforcement all crucial to their development. Respondents also questioned the assertion that students "become tired" and their belief that they are used to and enjoy being at school for 5 days a week. The proposal shows a lack of empathy and understanding of the complex and differing needs of FL students.

Although they note FL students may have access to Suffolk One for the 2 days, without appropriate support they will not have equality of access. Without 5 days many will be stuck at home without social or learning interaction. The additional costs for parents associated with finding suitable options for the 2 days is likely to mitigate against this happening and for some families this will have serious financial consequences. Parents of these students also have a right to a normal life.

It is suggested that we should comply with the draft SEND Code of Practice and provide 5 day provision and some parents consider this would be an issue which they would fight in the Courts.

Any plans to supplement the 3 day model with 2 days of complimentary provision must be on the basis that it is stimulating, meaningful, linked to the learning and measurable in terms of outcomes. There were a wide range of suggestions from parents on what might be included in such a package of provision. Any associated costs should not be charged to parents; if the costs are linked to Direct Payments then these would need to be increased accordingly and some suggested SCC should meet these costs.

The timing that has been made available to develop a solution, some parents believe has been insufficient and is placing great pressures on both students and parents. There is also the view that we need to listen and work more closely with parents now and in the future to develop appropriate provision and good outcomes. Further and improved joint working between organisations and agencies including SCC and Suffolk One must take place. Suffolk One needs to look for its debt and additional costs associated with providing a 5 day model to be met by others rather than the parents or the institution.

A view has also been expressed about the process and it not being structured in a way which enables a cohesive response from those opposed to the proposed changes- there should have been an open meeting. It is also suggested that it is not possible to achieve financial viability for this group of students and this should not be the aim.

Students blossom and grow at Suffolk One. This process has left some of the FL students confused and anxious about their future.

9.3 Summary of consultation meetings with parents/carers.

The sessions, which were conducted by the Principal and Vice- Principal, were attended, over two evenings, by the parents of 12 students who were either at Suffolk One or are planning to be here in September 2014.

All of the parents considered that a 5 day option was required. The majority believed this could be a mix of education and related development and socialising activities- linked to learning goals. Some of the parents wanted clarity about what would be offered on the 2 days and some had suggestions around

what this might include. One set of parents considered they had been lied to, some were disappointed, angry and very concerned that we suggested FL students getting tired and that we were only "going through the motions." There was some acknowledgement around the difficult funding issues but there was also a view that we should be able to afford to run a 5 day programme. Some parents considered that there had been a lack of communication and wanted assurances that we would report the outcomes of the consultation accurately. They believed the timing was deliberate to ensure it was announced before the new SEND code was agreed. There was also a suggestion that we need to work with parents and that we should meet with a set of parents who considered they were representative of the community who would be impacted by this proposal. Some parents also wanted detail about the discussions we have had with the Local Authority and with whom and when these meetings took place. The parents have apparently been told that we did not have any dialogue with the Local Authority before 4 February 2014. The question was asked around rumours that suggested we were already dismantling FL areas. There was a feeling from parents that Suffolk One should "make a stand" and escalate the funding issues related to these proposals. They also wanted confirmation about what was said to staff at a meeting on 2 May 2014, they had heard that management had said there would be no change as a result of this further consultation. Some parents intimated that without change to the plans, legal action would follow.

9.4 Suffolk County Council:

Suffolk County Council's initial response is set out below in full.

"Suffolk County Council does not support the proposal to reduce the learning offer to Foundation Learners from 5 to 3 days.

Suffolk One opened in 2010 and was set up to provide an inclusive sixth form school. Consequently, two special schools in Ipswich, Thomas Wolsey Special School and The Bridge Special School (formerly Belstead Special School) closed their post 16 provision. Post 16 pupils from these schools transferred to Suffolk One's 5 day provision.

There has been significant public investment in Suffolk One to make sure the building was fully accessible and staff had the appropriate level of skill and expertise to meet the needs of the most complex learners.

Equity:*We believe the proposal is discriminatory – the proposal is designed to deliver savings on Suffolk One's overall general budget but only impacts on those young people who are disabled – some of the most vulnerable learners in Suffolk.*

Students in West Suffolk and North Suffolk have access to a 5 day learning programme at their local special schools (Riverwalk and Warren School). The

Suffolk One proposal would therefore lead to an **inequitable** offer for pupils in South Suffolk.

A specific example of inequity within your proposals is evidenced in the paragraph at top of page 5, where it is stated that the pupils will be able to undertake 'unsupervised learning' on the two other days. However a sentence later it is stated that some pupils have needs such that this will be impossible for them and that Suffolk One will not provide any support. This confirms that the proposal will in fact prevent some pupils from attendance for more than 3 days.

Funding: SCC currently commission 80 special school places at Suffolk One. The funding for High Needs pupils has not decreased (see table and was indeed increased in 2012/13 to reflect increased pupil numbers). However, we do acknowledge that there has been a reduction in national funding for those pupils with moderate additional needs.

Academic year	Budget
2011/12	£0.376m for 44 places.
2012/13	£1.026m (not split as pre funding changes) for 80 places – place numbers and funding were increased to meet the level of demand.
2013/14	£0.800m Place Funding + £0.233m Top Up = £1.033m for 80 places.

We are reviewing the top up funding for 2014/15 to ensure that it is equitable with other providers and accurately reflects the needs of learners at Suffolk One. This work is complex and not yet complete.

The Needs of the Pupil: Pupils placed in our special schools, and those schools commissioned to provide places for pupils with special educational needs, have a range of complex needs. Many require support with their personal care needs. This can result in regular breaks from learning while their needs are attended to. We believe that condensing the learning into 3 days will further disadvantage these pupils.

The concentration span is shortened for a number of our special school pupils due to their sensory and communication needs and or medical needs. We would argue a 3 day programme would disadvantage these pupils.

The Offer: Suffolk One is a **sixth form school** not an F.E. college. The special schools in Suffolk provide a 5 day learning offer.

In their consultation document Suffolk One makes reference to "other "post 16 providers who offer a 3 day programme. These post 16 providers are F.E.

colleges, not schools who are required to provide 540 hours learning per year and the needs of learners in FE colleges are not at the same level.

Suffolk One argues in their consultation that pupils on a 5 day learning programme are prevented from engaging in other activities.

Our Special Schools currently actively support their pupils move into adulthood through their 5 day learning programme, this can include work experience and exploration of local recreation and leisure opportunities.

Should the proposals go forward, Suffolk One will need to provide support for pupils on non-teaching days. SCC is clear that when Suffolk One was set up it was commissioned by SCC to provide a 5 day offer for those pupils and that the specific funding for these places is both sufficient and has not changed. Therefore SCC will not provide additional funding for the 2 days because SCC has already provided funding for a 5 day offer. We would also note that Suffolk One is responsible for the safety and welfare of pupils on their premises.”

10. Further steps taken by Suffolk One in relation to consultation

It is apparent from the consultation responses that parents are dismayed by the provision of the FL timetable over three days rather than five, and in particular, as to how social and care needs can be properly met on the other two days, and the potential for dislocation if pupils cannot realistically attend Suffolk One on non-curriculum days. These are undesirable impacts, and Suffolk One has considered what if anything it can do to avoid these consequences.

Taking into account parental views expressed in consultation about potential mixed methodology funding provided by the EFA Social Care, Health direct payments from parents for developing programmes around independent/social/living skills, Suffolk One has also discussed with Suffolk County Council potential additional resources for the balance of 2 days in provision for the Foundation Learning Students if, after due consideration of all consultation responses and other relevant factors, the Foundation Proposals were to be adopted. These proposals included models of alternative, non-teaching delivery for 2 days per week at Suffolk One which might be:

1. Fully funded by the Local Authority
2. Staffing funded by the Authority, premises, resources and management funded by Suffolk One
3. Provision funded by a combination of other funding streams which might include contributions from families (via Direct Payments), from Social Care, Health or other stakeholders. This is the model that we understand is in operation in Surrey.
4. A model which is a mix of the three above

In response to these proposals, Suffolk County Council has declined to provide any further funding for any of these options on the grounds that the Local Authority does not have the capacity to fund other provision because funding is not available and is unwilling to attempt to do so because it would be setting a precedent for other FE institutions.

Subsequent to its various consultation responses above, Suffolk Legal (on behalf of SCC) has also asked the following new comment to be taken into account:

1. "The LA believes that the school should be able to manage its finances in a way that enables it to continue to provide 5 days of education to those pupils whose needs require it. The LA funds Suffolk one to a reasonable level and comparably with the other schools in Suffolk"

The School has already explained to the LA that comparing it to other Schools in Suffolk is a false comparison because the School's per pupil funding is all at a lower post-16 level, whilst other schools are funded at a higher rate per pupil for their compulsory school year pupils.

2. "the School was set up on the clear understanding that the Foundation Learning Provision was to replace (and in fact enhance) the then existing post-16 provision at the Thomas Wolsey and Belstead...it is unreasonable to suggest that any provision is a "replacement" which is not at least equivalent in teaching hours and number of days to that of previous provision...the LA expects Suffolk One to provide 5 days of education to any SEN child who requires it. To do so otherwise is a failure in its primary duty to those children."
3. "The LA suggests to group all the Foundation Learning Students together, is in itself a potentially discriminatory action, and that the impact of the proposed changes should be considered separately for each individual student with specific and identified needs."

The School has in fact carried out extensive preliminary work with all the individual students that might be affected by the Proposals to assess what individual effect those Proposals might have on them individually.

11. Legal Considerations

Given the legal issues raised by both parents and Suffolk County Council the School has been obliged to obtain advice from Stone King LLP and Helen Mountfield Q.C., and this section of this report draws on that advice.

Budget

Suffolk One is under a legal duty to run a balanced budget. For the reasons outlined above, it is currently running a licensed budget deficit, and it must take steps to work towards a balanced budget.

Statements of Special Educational Need

A pupil with a Statement of Special Educational Need has a right, enforceable against SCC, to the provision specified in that statement. If an individual statement contains a right to a particular number of hours of provision, that is an individual entitlement. Otherwise, Suffolk One as the named placement has a discretion as to how to make provision to meet specified needs.

None of the statements in question contain a requirement to deliver provision over a certain period of time each week.

Five day provision

Absent an individual entitlement in a statement of special educational need, DfE guidance suggests that full time provision is 540 taught hours per year. Suffolk One proposes to continue to provide more than that, albeit over a three day a week timetable. SCC has not contracted with Suffolk One to deliver the curriculum over five days, and many other pupils at the school will have the curriculum delivered in fewer than five days.

Legitimate expectation

There are some circumstances in which a person has been given a clear expectation, through a sufficiently clear statement or practice, that makes it legitimate for them to expect a particular course of action from a public body. A legitimate expectation may be that the public body will not change a provision or practice without first consulting those affected; or in some circumstances it can be substantive. However, even a substantive legitimate expectation can be defeated by sufficiently important countervailing public interests.

The Principal is unaware of any sufficiently clear statement to any parent or pupil as to give rise to a basis for a 'legitimate expectation' in a legal sense. Nonetheless, it is clear that some of the parents accepted places at Suffolk One on the understanding that there would be five day a week provision, whether of education or social care and other access to the school. In any case, Suffolk One would prefer to make five day a week access available if it had the budget

available to do so. The Proposal for Change proceeds on the basis that it has not, and cannot make sufficient savings elsewhere to do so.

In deciding whether to approve the Proposal for Change, it seems sensible for the governing body to proceed in recognition of the fact that parents did have those expectations, and that it would be unfair for the school to depart from them unless there are very strong countervailing considerations to the contrary. Unfortunately, in the Principal's view, the school's budget constraints and the lack of alternative sources of social care (from SCC) for the two remaining days a week do constitute such countervailing considerations, but the Governing Body must reach its own view on this.

Consultation

The Governing Body must be satisfied that those consulted have been given sufficient time and information to express their views on the proposed changes, and it must itself conscientiously take the consultation responses into account in deciding to approve the Proposal for Change made by the Principal in the light of those responses. However, consultation is not a referendum. The fact that the consultees are overwhelmingly opposed to the changes to 5-day a week supported access (which the Principal also would prefer not to make, if the budget were available) does not mean that the Governing Body must not also consider other relevant considerations and does not mean that it cannot approve the Proposal for Change in any event.

Equality

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Governing Body to give 'due regard' the statutory equality needs before deciding whether to approve the Proposal for Change. Caselaw establishes that it must address this duty 'in substance, with rigor and an open mind'. Part of the purpose of the consultation was to ensure that the Governing Body had sufficient information to give these matters proper open-minded and informed consideration.

Governors must consider the following questions:

- a) Is the Proposal for Change likely to give rise to potential discrimination (s149(1)(a) Equality Act 2010)? If so, is it a type of discrimination which can be proportionately justified, and is it justified?
- b) Is the measure likely to have an effect on the need to advance equality of opportunity for disabled people (s149(1)(b) Equality Act 2010)? Can steps be taken to mitigate any adverse effects on this, bearing in mind other relevant considerations?
- c) Is the measure likely to have an impact on promoting good relations between disabled and non-disabled people (s149(1)(c) Equality Act 2010). In particular, will it have any impact on promoting understanding? Can steps be taken to mitigate any adverse effect on this, bearing in mind other relevant considerations?

In the light of these questions, should the governors approve the Proposal for Change, bearing in mind all other relevant considerations, including the legal obligation to reach a balanced budget.

11.1 Potential Discrimination, Reasonable Adjustments and justification

The Proposals for Change (in final form after consultation and consideration of reasonable adjustments) would not cause direct disability discrimination, but the Principal understands that it is likely to result in unfavourable treatment of disabled students for a reason relating to their disability, or failure to provide auxiliary assistance. (Because they cannot access the school as easily without social care support, it is less likely and may be impossible for them to do so without the provision of it). For this to be lawful it must to be justified as a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

The legitimate aim is to ensure that the School keeps within its licensed budget deficit.

There will be constraints on the Foundation Students accessing the School site and facilities during the period each week (typically 2 days a week) when they will not have GLH in their timetable. The consultation responses show that this may have adverse social effects on students and their families.

The School is confident that there is no evidence that during the altered period of the week when GLH are delivered (typically 3 days a week) there will be any detriment caused by this change in timetabling to the Foundation Students in accessing the curriculum and facilities, specifically that no Foundation student will suffer any "cramming" effect through this timetabling. In such a case there

will be no material detriment of that type which required legal analysis. The School would expect that where there is any educational need for the timetable to be delivered over a longer time frame that would be reflected in the student's individual statement of special educational need and funded by SCC accordingly.

Available reasonable adjustments and auxiliary aids

To explain the standard required, the relevant DfE Guidance states that:

"4.13 The duty to make reasonable adjustments applies only to disabled people. For schools the duty is summarised as follows:

- Where something a school does places a disabled pupil at a disadvantage compared to other pupils then the school must take reasonable steps to try and avoid that disadvantage.
- Schools will be expected to provide an auxiliary aid or service for a disabled pupil when it would be reasonable to do so and if such an aid would alleviate any substantial disadvantage that the pupil faces in comparison to non-disabled pupils."...

4.18 The term "auxiliary aids" found in the Equality Act 2010 covers both auxiliary aids and services but there is no legal definition for what constitutes auxiliary aids and services. Considering the everyday meaning of the words, is, however, helpful. Legal cases have referred to the Oxford English Dictionary definition of auxiliary as "helpful, assistant, affording aid, rendering assistance, giving support or succour" and that auxiliary aids and services "are things or persons which help..."

4.23 The Act does **not** set out what would be a reasonable adjustment or a list of factors to consider in determining what is reasonable. It will be for schools to consider the reasonableness of adjustments based on the circumstances of each case. However, factors a school may consider when assessing the reasonableness of an adjustment may include the financial or other resources required for the adjustment, its effectiveness, its effect on other pupils, health and safety requirements, and whether aids have been made available through the Special Educational Needs route.

4.24 Cost will inevitably play a major part in determining what is reasonable and it is more likely to be reasonable for a school with substantial financial resources to have to make an adjustment with a significant cost, than for a school with fewer resources..."

The Principal has assessed that the School cannot provide the financial resources needed for the 2 day access. As noted earlier in this paper, he has not assumed

that all relevant savings will come from the FL budget. He has taken steps in every aspect of the school's operation, including hard decisions on enrichment, to make necessary savings.

In his view – which the Governing Body is asked to consider, the scale of the costs savings required and the absence of alternative sources of saving or funding are such that regrettably it is justifiable to make the Proposals for Change and not to make adjustments in the form of providing social care on days when the curriculum is not provided, or continuing to provide the curriculum over five days of the week.

This view is formed on the basis of the financial information set out above which describes how:

- a) It has a very substantial overall deficit that it must address; and
- b) It has made cuts across its provision to all students.

The School's position, therefore, is that it will not be able to facilitate the 2 day access financially without additional external resources. It has investigated the following other potential sources of funding and/or resources without success:

Local Authority

Despite our request, the Local Authority has to date expressly declined to provide any more funding or resources towards the options put forward by Suffolk One for the 2 day access.

Other public agencies or charities

Suffolk One has investigated other sources of funding, but has not been able to access other sources of funding to support the delivery of FL courses as other agencies will only be able to deliver funding against provision that is seen as new.

Voluntary contributions

It would not be lawful for the School to seek compulsory contributions and does not consider it would be either equitable, lawful or realistically possible to ask parents to pay for the provision of social care on days when Suffolk One cannot afford to do so.

The Principal asks the governing body to approve the Proposal for Change on the basis that there are no reasonable adjustments or auxiliary aids or services which it is reasonably possible for it to make.

Justification for discrimination

If reasonable adjustments cannot eliminate the unfavourable treatment, justification must be made about why that unfavourable treatment is a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aim.

The unfavourable treatment is deeply regrettable but the object of reducing such a significant deficit justifies that treatment in law.

The Governing Body is asked to satisfy itself that it agrees with the Principal's analysis that sufficient further cuts cannot be made to any other part of the school's budget and if, as it appears, other sources of finance are not forthcoming, the Proposals for Change are necessary notwithstanding the disadvantage caused to disabled pupils.

The Governors will need to be satisfied that no other less detrimental outcome could have been achieved given the resources available to the School. The Principal draws the governors' attention to the fact that he and his team have considered models that have a mixture of 3 and 4 day, but in his view these represent nearly as great a change whilst still failing to ensure financial viability and sustainability.

This report explains how cuts have also been made to other parts of the School's provision which has affected the other students in the School. The Governors need to decide whether that balance is fair, within the realities of how resources have been deployed and could be deployed in the School's current circumstances.

Advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations

Governors must consider in the light of the statutory equality needs (including but not limited to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination) the potential equality consequences of:

- (i) curriculum re-arrangement and
- (ii) any restriction of five day a week supported access to the site.

Considering the above will require consideration of how the impact of Foundation Students' reduced access to the school premises for two days a week might affect attitudes of non-disabled pupils, and integration of disabled and non-disabled pupils.

If the two day access cannot be achieved, the Principal considers that this will have adverse effects on opportunities for Foundation Students to participate in school life and will limit their ability to mix with other non-disabled students. As noted above, he has considered how, if at all, these adverse effects can be avoided, but unless there is support from a third party (for example, if SCC

agrees to fund social care provision on site), he does not see how these effects can be avoided.

This is a key consideration to be borne in mind when the Governing Body makes its decision about the Proposals for Change. If those Proposals are adopted, it is proposed that there is monitoring of the impact on pupils, and that there be frequent future reconsideration of how this equality of opportunity is being advanced by the School. This should include regular reconsideration of how the 2 day access might be introduced in the future.

Insofar as possible with reduced support for physical access, the Principal considers that Foundation pupils are well integrated into the whole student body. Accommodation which is currently used by them across the school will remain the same and we will remain flexible in our approach to ensuring they are able to socialise with all students during lunch and break times which is the current situation. There will be no impact on the already established good relations which exist between disabled and non- disabled people. Students currently studying on Health and Social Care course at Levels 2 and 3 have and will remain to be proactive in being involved for extended periods of time in supporting FL students in classes and also in joining them for periods of time during lunchtime. In addition since opening there has been a strong engagement by students and staff across the areas of Art and Performance with FL students being very much part of cross-college Performances and additional cross-college curricular. Foundation Learning students bring an added dimension to the life of the school and one which is hugely valued and contributes significantly to the high levels of positive behaviour and understanding demonstrated by all.

12. Principal's Recommendation to Governing Body

There was a relatively limited response to the consultation. However, from those that have replied, the responses clearly indicate that a 5 day model is what is desired by parents/ carers. A model of three-day curriculum delivery and two day care would still save the School money, and would be seen as a good way forward by the vast majority of respondents and a programme which would benefit students and has the support of most parents/ carers. However the provision within the 2 day period needs to be closely linked to the 3 days of taught time and be relevant, with clear objectives and outcomes and for some students this full 5 day model at Suffolk One may not be appropriate.

Consultees have suggested that Suffolk One should work with SCC to try to arrange this appropriate provision. For the reasons set out above, the Principal agrees that this would be desirable, but SCC has indicated an unwillingness to discuss further funding with the School.

This is very regrettable. SCC's response which was received on 5th June 2014 states that; "*Suffolk County Council does not support the proposal to reduce the learning offer to Foundation Learners from 5 to 3 days.*" Given that SCC supported, was fully engaged with and met the cost of redundancies associated with the implementation of the FL proposals earlier in the process its stance is somewhat confusing. At a meeting on 2 June 2014, SCC indicated that there were no extra funds to facilitate an alternative 2 day model.

The Principal therefore invites the Governing Body to satisfy itself with his analysis, as set out above. His proposal is that it decides to adopt the Proposals for Change, but to continue to take steps with SCC to seek to ensure that social care is made available by SCC on Suffolk One premises where possible and appropriate for individual pupils to mitigate any adverse social effects of the regrettable, but necessary, proposed changes.