

# SESLIP Section 19 Policy and Practice Development Group

## Practice Summary and Guide

DfE – RIIA: Universal SENDAP Project 21: Sept 2025 to  
April 2026.

*For presentation to May 2026 meeting of Education  
Directors, not for circulation ahead of final publication  
following that meeting.*



## SESLIP Section 19 Community of Practice group

Pack: Contents

### Table of Contents

|                                                                                          |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction: scope and ‘what is section 19?’ .....</b>                            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2. Advice for review of local policies and from the LGSC Ombudsman .....</b>          | <b>5</b>  |
| a. Local policy advice .....                                                             | 5         |
| b. Example content for a local policy .....                                              | 5         |
| c. Current advice from Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO).....           | 6         |
| <b>3. Decision-making by the LA and CPD / staff briefings: .....</b>                     | <b>8</b>  |
| a. Proposed agreement in principle: .....                                                | 8         |
| Inclusive section 19 decision leadership: for pupils, including those with an EHCP ..... | 8         |
| Hampshire: Example of clear, staged decision flowchart: .....                            | 8         |
| b. Example checklist when considering need under section 19 .....                        | 9         |
| c. Briefing children’s services teams .....                                              | 9         |
| <b>4. Partnerships with local schools .....</b>                                          | <b>11</b> |
| <b>5. Financial pressures and incentives .....</b>                                       | <b>13</b> |
| a. Possible theme for ‘agreement in principle’ (recoupment):.....                        | 13        |
| <b>6. Summary and Potential Themes for Further Progress in 2026-27 .....</b>             | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Annex.....</b>                                                                        | <b>15</b> |
| LA Briefing and CPD materials .....                                                      | 15        |
| Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman .....                                         | 15        |
| Financial recoupment from schools – Reading Borough Council .....                        | 15        |
| Acknowledgements: .....                                                                  | 17        |



## 1. Introduction: scope and 'what is section 19?'

### Project scope

Local authorities (LAs) in the South-east (SE) are all reporting increasing pressures to fund suitable education under section 19 (S19) of the Education Act 1996 and have concerns about complaint determinations (particularly from the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman).

SESLIP funded a project to support LA peer-to-peer learning and practice development to support:

- updated and more robust LA policies across S19
- clearer decision-making and responsibilities across children's services for S19
- case studies, including of shared strategies to prevent S19 with local schools.
- up to 4 projects between 10 LAs working together to address these themes.

### Relevant Legislation and Extracts from National Guidance

Every child in England of compulsory school age has an entitlement to a full-time education, and this is codified in the Education Act 1996:

- Section 7 states 'the parent of every child of compulsory school age shall ensure they receive efficient full-time education suitable to his age, ability and aptitude.'
- Section 19 places a power on LAs to: 'Make arrangements for the provision of suitable education at school or otherwise than at school for those children of compulsory school age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, may not for any period receive a suitable education unless such arrangements are made for them.'
- In its renewed vision for education set out in: "Every Child Achieving and Thriving" (DfE 2026) the Department for Education (DfE) expects 'all children to have access to stretching, enriching and inclusive school experiences' supported by 'an inclusive education system that delivers high standards for all'.
- DfE guidance further clarifies S19: 'Local authorities are responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who – because of illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age who are residents in the local authority area, whether they are on the roll of a school, and whatever type of school they attend.' (<sup>1</sup> DfE, Dec 2023)
- Where possible, the child's health needs should be managed by the home school so that they can continue to be educated there with support, and without the need for the intervention of the local authority. However, as soon as it is clear that the home school can no longer support the child's health needs and provide suitable education, the school should speak to the local authority about putting alternative provision in place. There is no absolute legal deadline by which local authorities must start to arrange education for children with additional health needs. However, as soon as it is clear that a child will be away from school for 15 days or more because of their health needs, the local authority should ensure there are arrangements for suitable alternative provision. (<sup>1</sup>DfE, Dec 2023)

---

<sup>1</sup> DfE Dec 2023: [Arranging education for children who cannot attend school because of health needs.](#)





- Most children and young people who are supported through S19 of the Education Act 1996 have SEND. As well as their home school managing health needs, the SEND Code of Practice expects: 'where a pupil is identified as having SEN, schools should take action to remove barriers to learning and put effective special educational provision in place. This SEN support should take the form of a four-part cycle through which earlier decisions and actions are revisited, refined and revised with a growing understanding of the pupil's needs and of what supports the pupil in making good progress and securing good outcomes. This is known as the graduated approach.' (<sup>2</sup>DfE, Jan 2015)
- \*The term 'suitable education' is defined as: efficient education suited to the child's age, ability, and aptitude, and to any special educational needs he or she may have. Education to be arranged by the LA should be on a full-time basis, unless, in the interests of the child, part-time education is considered to be more suitable. This would be for reasons relating to the child's physical or mental health. Described in guidance: alternative education 'should offer good quality education equivalent to that provided in mainstream (or special) schools'. (<sup>3</sup>DfE, Feb 2025).
- To aid reintegration, as far as possible, the child should be able to access the curriculum and materials that they would have used in their home school. This could also include attending educational visits, even if this requires providing extra and suitable support. .... Local authorities should work with schools to set up an individually tailored reintegration plan for each child. (<sup>4</sup>DfE Dec 2023)
- Section 61 of the Children and Families Act 2014: LAs have the power to consent to a child or young person with SEND being educated somewhere other than a school or post-16 institution; education other than at school (EOTAS). This is only when there has been assessment of need and the LA is satisfied that it would be inappropriate for the provision to be made in a school or post-16 institution and, for example, aligns with meeting needs set out in a child's education, health and care plan (EHCP).
- Once the LA has decided that the test for EOTAS for a child with SEND under S61 has been met, it is for the LA to decide what is the package and how it is to be delivered, as they have a duty to secure the provision in section F (if there is an EHCP).

---

<sup>2</sup> Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years. (DfE, Jan 2015)

<sup>3</sup> Arranging Alternative Provision (DfE, Feb 2025)





## 2. Advice for review of local policies and from the LGSC Ombudsman

### a. Local policy advice

Considered advice is that an LA nests its policy position for S19 duties within a wider attendance and/or inclusion policy / framework. In this way the principle of an entitlement to full-time, suitable education (by default at school) and parental responsibilities to ensure their child(ren) receives said full-time education are set out in the context of the local inclusive education system.

Among the challenges expressed by LAs participating in the project is that national guidance offers only broad definitions and clarification of responsibilities (for example there is hardly any reference to s61 of the Children and Families Act 2014 in the SEND Code of Practice (DfE, Jan 2015). There is also a view from SE LAs that national guidance has not kept pace with system pressures, including for the identification of SEND, and demands from some parents. For example there are a minority of parents whose child does not have an EHCP, who find out about 'education other than at school' (EOTAS) and become set on this being the only suitable provision for their child in the long-term.

Under S61 LAs have powers to consent to a child or young person with SEND being educated somewhere other than a school or post-16 institution; education other than at school (EOTAS). This should be when the LA is satisfied that it would be inappropriate for the provision to be made in a school or post-16 institution and aligns with meeting assessed needs set out where there is an EHCP.

The blurred overlapping between S19 and S61 leaves LAs facing competing and at times contradictory pressures including:

- ensuring efficient, suitable, full-time education, and
- good school attendance, and
- parental perception of what they think is suitable education for their child, and
- misconceptions among parent groups fuelled by misinformation online or simplistic analysis by AI, and
- increased wellbeing needs of a greater number of children.

### b. Example content for a local policy

As well as the local inclusive education system providing the context for S19 arrangements, the group reflected on advice for wording of local policy statements. There was agreement that the procedural elements should reflect local protocols with schools and trusts and the relevant team responsibilities within the LA. The detailed local procedures and guides for decision-making should be referenced in local policies, whilst the details are best set out in support information or appendices, so they can be kept up-to-date.

Likewise, timely and clear communication with parents and carers is an important principle and materials and templates should be drafted to help to deliver this. The view of the LAs is that, for the large majority, S19 arranged education should be temporary and have the goal of reintegration to suitable, full-time schooling (usually at the home school). Evidence is in the long term, school offers the best chance for children and young people to thrive, achieve and attain (see: [section 3](#)).

Elements of policy statements that were identified as more challenging include:

- clarifying the expectations of home schools (early information about absences, reasonable adjustments and support for medical needs).





- absences within the 'or otherwise' scope of the legislation; offering local clarification for schools.
- LAs' duty to assess need and arrange suitable education – what if this is refused by parent / carers?

There follows examples of content suitable for an LA's Section 19 policy statement, which could be consider for adaption when reviewing a local policy.

Expectations of the home school:

To support the LAs' duty (detailed in 1.5 & 1.6) the home school has duties as outlined in Regulations 13(7b) 13(9) 13(10) and 13(11) of the School Attendance (Pupil Registrations) (England) Regulations 2024 to provide to the LA, at agreed intervals, the full name and address of any pupils of compulsory school age who are not attending school regularly (including due to their health needs).

The Education Act 1996 also places a responsibility on schools to continue to provide education in the interim period while an assessment of need is undertaken to inform the LA's S19 decision or offer.

Refusal or non-access of S19 offer

If the LA has assessed a child's needs under S19 and offers alternative education that it considers to be reasonable and workable for that child, it is not required to arrange further provision if the child or family chooses not to take up that offer.

Parents are reminded that, under Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, they are responsible for ensuring their child receives a suitable education while they are of compulsory school age. In this situation, the LA considers that suitable education has been made available. Continued non-attendance may therefore lead to consideration of attendance enforcement.

**Portsmouth City**

**A unitary LA with 62 state schools within the local area**

**Portsmouth:** Portsmouth has moved away from the use of S19 as a named offer or provision. This reflects a strategic shift towards ensuring that children and young people are supported to access a suitable education, based on assessed need, and away from a focus on the mechanism through which that education is organised. Where there is a prolonged absence from school linked to medical need, education is provided through established, though nuanced, pathways. This forms part of the wider approach to inclusive mainstream provision across Portsmouth. Where the LA has duties to be involved, arrangements should be understood as a temporary educational intervention for the majority, and rooted in assessment and the duty to secure suitable education.

**c. Current advice from Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO)**

Guidance for LAs from the LGSCO is that ensuring there is timely and transparent decision-making, communicated clearly to parents, will go a long way to averting parents resorting to the complaints route.

The challenge that LAs are facing is reflected in the increasing number of complaints under 'section 19 and alternative provision' dealt with by LGSCO:

In 2019-20: total 53

In 2024-25: total 400.





Specific process expectations of LAs:

- Make timely and clear decisions on whether a section 19 duty exists
- Achieve this by taking account of information from relevant parties
- Maintain records and evidence; showing the LA has weighed-up evidence and recorded decisions, with reasons
- Communicate decisions to parents in clear language and in a timely fashion, together with the reasons for the decision
- Make clear the LA's expectations about school attendance, available support, and consequences of continued non-attendance, in particular if no provision under S19 is warranted.
- Provide clear information about complaints procedures at the LA.

All the above points can be found in more detail together with examples of complaints cases in the LGSCO Guide for Practitioners:

<https://www.lgo.org.uk/assets/attach/6865/Children-out-of-school-F.pdf> (Oct 2025)



# SESLIP

South East Sector Led  
Improvement Programme

### 3. Decision-making by the LA and CPD / staff briefings:

Practice from LAs highlights that there are sufficient distinctions in the procedures for identifying whether there is need under S19 and the responsibilities of the LA between children with SEND and an EHCP, and the majority of pupils. The considered view of the project group and SESLIP Education Directors is that there should be a parallel approach to decision leadership between these two groups of learners.

The following is still under consideration as a South-east position of principle.

#### a. Proposed agreement in principle:

#### Inclusive section 19 decision leadership: for pupils, including those with an EHCP

"Parents / carers are responsible under the Education Act 1996 to ensure everyone of their children receives an efficient, full-time education suitable to their age, ability and aptitude and South-east LAs are committed to supporting parents /carers to meet this. As part of LAs' commitment to an inclusive education system, they also work closely with schools in each LA to support them maintain excellent levels of school attendance and to advise them about reasonable adjustment when pupils have additional needs, as part of their ordinarily available provision.

- When an LA is notified of a child with prolonged absence from their home school, we will take prompt action to review the matter and any concerns between the school and the child's parents.
- When the child has SEND and an EHCP (or is part way through the EHC needs assessment process) the LA's SEND manager will take lead responsibility to oversee the review of the situation and the reasons for absences (supported by the Access to Education team). Their actions on behalf of the LA will include taking a view whether there are any issues with either a lack of delivery of aspects of an EHCP or the content of the EHCP, including the named placement. If necessary, an interim annual review can be called to ensure a thorough review process including consultation with parents / carers.
- For pupils where there is prolonged absence and no EHCP, the [Access to Education or equivalent] manager will take lead responsibility to oversee the review of the situation and any underlying issues for the absence(s). Prompt assessment of need will take place and lead to a timely decision about the best way to ensure suitable full-time (or part-time if in child's best interests) education is accessed: through a return to school (with reasonable adjustments where needed), attendance enforcement, or interim alternative education under section 19."

#### Hampshire: Example of clear, staged decision flowchart:



Hants%20S19%20Flow%20Charts%20decision





## b. Example checklist when considering need under section 19

The following questions are offered for consideration by LAs and should be reviewed and adapted for the local area before being used or published.

- Is the child under 5 or older than 16 (i.e. not of compulsory school age)?
- Would the child receive suitable education without alternative S19 provision?
- Is it reasonably possible or reasonably practicable for a child to be attending / return to their school?

These are an initial objective test with a high bar and is to be assessed by the LA. If no to all of them, then S19 education should be arranged.

- What S19 educational provision is suitable, reasonably possible, and reasonably practicable for the child to access? This is a factual question for the LA to determine and will depend on the specific facts of the case.
- If the child is a child with SEND, will the child not receive suitable education unless such S19 education arrangements are made for them? This is fact specific; the focus is that the LA offers suitable education with reasonable adjustments. This is an objective assessment, and the views of the parents are not determinative.
- Is the child unable to attend school but able to learn?
- What is their suitability for independent learning and what are the home circumstances?
- What are the child's needs? Their age, ability, aptitude, and any special educational needs; what do these suggest a suitable and efficient education needs to involve?
- How are these needs best to be met?
- What assessments have been undertaken in school and what have these identified?
- Is there a medical opinion? What is the supporting medical evidence?
- What other evidence is available and what is this suggesting?
- What is the plan for reintegrating back into school?
- Are there reasons relating to the child's physical or mental health which would suggest that, in the interests of the child, part-time education is more suitable than full-time education temporarily?
- Would children with long-term medical conditions or any other physical or mental health needs affecting attendance require additional support to continue their education?

## c. Briefing children's services teams

There has been a national policy priority for all pupils to return to good levels of school attendance, following the hiatus of the Covid-19 pandemic. LAs should be pro-active to inform their many children's services teams, about the responsibilities of all to understand the value of good school attendance, and their local arrangements to promote this and who to inform if concerns arise. Timely communication within the LA and sufficiently clear understanding among officers whether certain information that they hold is of relevance to S19 duties, and to then act upon it, have been a specific area of criticism of LA processes by the LGSCO when assessing complaints.



Key ingredients identified for effective briefing and dissemination:

- Leadership: there is communication from directorate leadership about the importance and to set aside team time to be briefed;
- Coordination: briefings around inclusion, attendance and S19 are set within the wider CPD strategies for the directorate;
- Flexibility: production of intranet materials and webinars which offer flexibility for staff to access and can be part of new staff induction;
- Accurate contacts: ensure key contact information is kept up-to-date, since they can be affected by staff turnover or system changes;
- Two-way communication: ensure teams with a case management role are informed about S19 decisions affecting children and young people they support and involved in developing and updating the goals.

Examples of briefing materials for children's services staff have been shared by project LAs and are available in the [Annex](#) .

Colleagues working in the NHS also play an important part in assessing the needs of children who might fall under the scope of S19. Although outside the scope of this project, several of the LAs have connected with health partners to both provide briefings for their staff, emphasising that good school attendance is also of good value for a child's health and wellbeing, as well as their education.



#### 4. Partnerships with local schools

The experience of the project LAs is that policy and decision-making under S19 is best integrated within their local inclusive education system and in partnership with schools and trusts. In order to achieve the goal of efficient, suitable, full-time education for children of compulsory school age, S19 arrangements should, in the main, be an intervention rather than a destination and include in the pupil's objectives and targets clear and achievable steps for a return to full-time school education. A robust partnership between the LA and school and early identification of need / absences that might precipitate S19 lead to the best chance of achieving successful reintegration following intervention.

A further driver for the LAs has been that their evidence that: education under S19 is best if temporary, since a richer curriculum is available at school, and the learner has access to more, skilled staff; for example, who can better support and educate leading to the child thriving and achieving.

The S19 duty on the LA does not extend beyond the compulsory school age of 16. After this, FE college becomes the default offer for learners who have had an extended period of S19 education. The experience of LAs is that too many young people for whom S19 has been arranged, mostly or entirely as one-to-one tuition, drop-out from post-16 courses. The learners struggle with the learning environment, despite many having attained some good GCSEs. As a result, they do not go on to achieve level 3 qualifications and are much more likely to become 'not in education, employment or training' (NEET).

The following practice vignettes of initiatives by LAs are illustrative of approaches and developments across the South-east.

##### Bracknell Forest Council

##### A unitary LA with 39 state schools within the local area

**Bracknell Forest:** had identified that the majority of learners it provided S19 education for resulted in longer term provision largely from 1:1 tuition providers. Although some GCSEs were achieved by secondary learners, their move to FE college was broadly unsuccessful and tutors too often put barriers in the way of plans to reintegrate to school at an earlier stage. The revised arrangements have involved a move away from agency staffing to: delivery of a pastoral tutor role by HLTAs employed by the LA and the expectation that the home school takes lead responsibility for curriculum materials, and what remote learning the pupil should access online. Already this has increased the rate of return to full-time school-based education.

##### Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

##### A unitary LA with 60 state schools within the local area

**Windsor and Maidenhead:** When reviewing the local arrangements for S19 and their effectiveness for the learner, the LA identified too few returning to mainstream school and this was partly due to a lack on ongoing relationship between the learner, their family and the school. They also wished to shift away from 1:1 tuition to more small group learning. This offers more similarity with learning at school whilst allowing flexibility to address wellbeing needs and a personalised curriculum. The LA now uses local LA learning centres for tutor-led sessions and have established the expectation that home schools are actively involved. This involvement includes providing learning materials for the tutor to use with their pupil and for school staff to visit to maintain and build relationships to ease towards reintegration. Reintegration is now more frequent.





# SESLIP

South East Sector Led  
Improvement Programme

## Reading Borough Council

A unitary LA with 61 state schools within the local area

**Reading and AV1 remote learning hubs:** AV1s are personal video connection hubs in the classroom which allow individual pupils on roll at the school, but under a period of absence, to participate in lessons and access their class's curriculum. As a result their school is able to maintain responsibility for curriculum and some reasonable oversight of the pupil's progress. Pupils are also able to maintain some level of social relationships with their peers. The LA gave consideration to charging, but decided against as this was potentially counter-productive since it has proved a better solution than 1:1 tuition and effective when there are short to medium term S19 arrangements.

One point raised, however, is that DfE attendance guidance / coding can be a barrier to the deployment of AV1s.

## Surrey County Council

A unitary LA with 396 state schools within the local area

**Surrey – restructure of LA roles to facilitate earlier intervention:** As part of a restructure and working more closely with schools within localities across the county, the Children not in School (CNIIS) team was set up. The team has responsibility for S19 duties, maintaining policies and guidance, together with decision-making; as members of S19 decision making panel for children absent from school due to health needs or otherwise. In particular team members have capacity to work with schools at an earlier stage when patterns of absences are reported.

Wider inclusion support includes the development of practice and monitoring arrangements for children accessing alternative provision, particularly those with an EHCP who are not registered at a school. Plus joining up with monitoring of children missing education and support for families who electively home educate (EHE) their child(ren).





## 5. Financial pressures and incentives

LAs have discussed the potential of financial measures as a 'stick' to promote inclusive actions by schools, alongside the other strategies offered to work in partnership to support and address pupil needs. Directors recognise that the cost of S19 provision is significant to LAs, while if the pupil is still on roll at a school, National Funding Formula funding remains within that school or trust's budget.

Some South-east LAs have proposed that protocols to recoup pro-rata Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding from schools where, for example, they off-roll rather than engaging with local processes, helps to incentivise more inclusive and collegiate practice. In other circumstances, recoupment could address a perverse incentive where a school could collude with prolonged absences and then guide a parent to LA S19 rather than using its funding to explore how to better meet the learning needs of the pupil with their family.

Below is a draft statement of principle between South-east Education Directors. Discussions continue about it and it is recognised that local relationships with school and capacity to administer financial recoupment mean that it is ultimately a decision for individual LAs how best to proceed.

### a. Possible theme for 'agreement in principle' (recoupment):

"South-east LAs are committed to maintaining a pupil's entitlement to education. The LAs are also committed to inclusive education and to supporting parents / carers in their responsibilities to ensure every child receives their entitlement to a suitable, full-time education (section 7 Education Act 1996). For the overwhelming majority this is at a school. LAs also offer support to schools with a goal to maintain excellent levels of school attendance and to adapt to their pupils' needs through ordinarily available provision. For a small number of pupils who are subject to exclusion or prolonged periods of absence (for example of greater than 15 days), [South-east] LAs fulfil their responsibilities under section 19 and partner with the home school and family to put in place suitable, interim education until a return to full-time education is deemed possible.

A school receives per-pupil funding for educating each pupil on their roll. One feature of the partnership between an LA and the home school is about funding. S19 provision might be arranged by the home school or, if it is arranged by the LA, the expectation is that the school contributes towards the LA's cost of S19 provision. Usually this will involve a pro-rata recoupment of the per pupil funding. Further, if, following investigation, the LA identifies that non-compliant practice by a school has contributed to the requirement for section 19 arrangements, the LA will seek to recoup the full per pupil funding from the school related to the expense of the provision made."

There is on-going discussion about this statement a shared position across SE LAs.

Reading Borough Council has shared part of a paper discussed with its Schools Forum about their proposal for finance as an incentive for schools to maintain an entitlement to education for all pupils. The arrangement could also offset some costs if the LA finds itself making alternative arrangements at short notice. This can be found in the [Annex](#).



## 6. Summary and Potential Themes for Further Progress in 2026-27

Overall, 10 LAs participated in this project in 2025-26, including sharing local practice and discussing key developments and challenges about:

- Ways to make decision leadership and processes clearer and ways to communicate with parents more effectively;
- Weighing-up and share sections to update in an LA S19 policy statements;
- Their developing arrangements with local schools that increase the likelihood of reintegration to full-time school after a period of S19 provision;
- Approaches to business case development for increase capacity to manage demands;
- Financial protocols with local schools which align with the local inclusive education vision and reduce 'perverse incentives'.

The projects and discussions have reported into all South-east LAs through the SESLIP Access to Education Group.

Themes that made partial progressed include:

- Example of business case development to better address S19 demand.
- Financial recoupment arrangements: shared position between for South-east LAs.
- Comparable data about S19 learner numbers in LAs proves challenging.

The project LAs are very conscious of the current national consultation about the DfE's SEND Reform Policy Paper. These policy proposal are an important consideration for future arrangements around S19 of the Education Act 1996, since the large majority of learners who access such provision are identified as having SEND.

## Annex

### LA Briefing and CPD materials

Consistent understanding of the value of good school attendance and the LA powers and goals under S19 are important across many teams in LA children's services.

Two LAs provided examples of materials they have developed to brief colleagues and guide them through the expectations of all teams and how they can be supported by colleagues with more specialised access to education expertise:

- **Bracknell Forest:**



BFC%20SEND%20Te  
am%20Section%2019

- **Surrey County Council:**



Surrey%20S19%20tra  
ining%20update%20S

### Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman

SESLIP has been able to meet with LGCSO representatives which has proved valuable in addressing the complaints aspect of this theme.

- Materials shared include:



Section%2019%20sli  
des%20(LGSCO-%20E

- a slide presentation:



LGSCO%20S19\_AP%  
20-%20Q%5e0A%20N

- Q&A responses:

### Financial recoupment contributions towards s19 from schools – Reading Borough Council

The following is an extract from a paper presented by the LA to the Reading Schools Forum. Subsequently steps were taken to initiate arrangements to recoup AWPU from a school where there are actions taken by the school that fall counter to the local equitable and inclusive approach to education.

1. *Schools are provided with national funding formula in the form of an annual minimum per pupil level of £4,955 for primary schools, and £6,465 for secondary schools with year groups 7 to 11.*



2. Schools retain their formula funding for pupils during the period of any alternative provision and will therefore only be allocated funds from the LA where this supersedes their funding allocation for the pupil, based on evidence such as a provision map.

3. In cases where evidence is unable to be provided, the LA may seek to recoup costs based on the circumstances of the pupil. For example, where the LA provides education for a pupil who has never attended the school site or received educational provision, full formulae funding will be recouped or that equal to the provision being made for the child.

#### 15. Resolving disputes

Disputes may occur under this policy between schools, families and the LA where decisions and/or recommendations are contested by schools or families. In these instances, the complaints procedures should be followed and issues resolved informally in the first instance. Sharing concerns in writing and resolving through a meeting, phone call or other form of contact will assist in reaching a position of understanding or alternative outcome.

Should the dissatisfied party continue to consider the matter unresolved, the complaints policy can be found here: [Compliments and Complaints - Brighter Futures For Children](#).

Where it is discovered that the Local Authority providing provision under this policy being made is related to unlawful, discriminatory or non-compliant school practice, this will be made clear to the school through contact with the Headteacher, and assurances to prevent recurrence will be sought on the particular concern in line with BFfC policy. This should not delay provision being made for the child. In all cases immediate action is required to safeguard and ensure children's educational entitlement through application of children missing education procedures.

Examples of unlawful, discriminatory or non-compliant school practices include which may lead to the S19 duty being invoked (not exhaustive):

- A child is unlawfully removed from the school roll for the benefit of the school (off-rolling)
- A child is suspended or excluded unlawfully (without lawful reason or applying compliant procedures from statutory guidance and legislation)
- A child is severely absent from school with no oversight or application of attendance procedures from the school, or attempts to reintegrate or refusal to provide reintegration intervention to the child and their family.

In all cases, provision costs will be recouped from the school related to the expense of the provision made, and the case referred to the DfE Regional Director in the case of an Academy School.

Regarding LA processes: advice from LA finance colleagues was that concentrating on recoupment of AWPU is most practical to administer. For example, this could take the form of invoicing to recoup on a half-termly, in-arrears basis within the academic year.



### Acknowledgements:

To colleagues from the following local authorities who participated in the project and contributed time and insights from the valuable work they are developing:

- Bracknell Forest Council
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Isle of Wight Council
- Kent County Council
- Portsmouth City Council
- Reading Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
- West Berkshire Council
- Wokingham Borough Council