

## Response to Request for Information

Reference      FOI 000340  
Date            03 August 2016

### ***Formal Permanent Exclusion from Secondary Schools***

**Request:**

**Formal Permanent Exclusion from Secondary Schools: Independent Review Panels and the Power to Direct a £4,000 Readjustment / Payment toward a Pupil's Continuing Education**

I am writing to request information on one aspect of the independent review process that applies to formal permanent exclusion.

A.    Maintained Secondary Schools

1.    What was the total number of formal permanent exclusions from maintained secondary schools in your area in each of the academic years 2014-15 and 2015-16? Please also state the total number of maintained schools and pupil population to which each annual total relates?

We can confirm that the department holds information that you have asked for in relation to the above. However, the information is exempt under section 21 of the FOI Act because it is reasonably accessible to you, and I am pleased to inform you that you can access it on our website via the following links:

<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10350&p=0>  
<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10459&p=0>

Section 21(1) of the Freedom of Information Act exempts disclosure of information that is reasonably accessible by other means, and the terms of the exemption mean that we do not have to consider whether or not it would be in the public interest for you to have the information.

You can find out more about Section 21 by reading the extract from the Act, available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/36/section/21>

2.    For each academic year: Of those pupils permanently excluded from maintained secondary schools in your area (Q1), in relation to how many pupils did their parents apply for review by an independent review panel (IRP)?  
[In 2014-2015 there was 1](#)  
[In 2015-2016 there were 2](#)
3.    For each academic year: Of those pupils' formal permanent exclusions reviewed by IRPs (Q2), how many reviews were determined in favour of the

pupil?

None

4. For each academic year: Of those reviews determined in favour of the pupil (Q3), in relation to how pupils many did the IRP direct reconsideration by the governors?

N/A

5. For each academic year: Of those reviews determined in favour of the pupil in relation to which the IRP directed reconsideration by the governors (Q4), in relation to how many pupils did the IRP order that the school's budget should be readjusted by a £4,000 payment (in addition to funding that would usually follow the pupil) towards the costs of finding alternative education for that pupil, should the excluding school either
- (a) uphold the exclusion despite that direction, and/or
  - (b) fail to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the IRP ordered (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

6. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the IRP ordered that, should the school uphold the exclusion despite the direction to the governors to reconsider and/or fail to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations, the school's budget should be readjusted by a £4,000 payment (Q5), in relation to how many pupils did the £4,000 readjustment become due, and was it because the excluding school either:
- (a) upheld the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or
  - (b) failed to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the readjustment became due because of reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

7. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the £4,000 readjustment became due (Q6), in relation to how many pupils did you, the local authority (LA), readjust the excluding school's budget by £4,000 as a result of the excluding school either
- (a) upholding the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or
  - (b) failing to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, your readjustment of the excluding school's budget was attributable to reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

8. For each academic year: Of those readjustments of £4,000 you, the LA, made to schools' budgets (Q7), in relation to how many pupils did you pass on the

£4,000 to that pupil's new education provider?

For each pupil in relation to whom you passed on the £4,000 readjustment, please specify the nature of the new education provider and whether the pupil had been found a place at that new provider before or after the excluding school decided to uphold its decision to exclude.

N/A

## **B. Academies (Secondary Schools)**

1. What was the total number of formal permanent exclusions that Academies (secondary level) in your area reported to you in each of the academic years 2014-15 and 2014-15? Please also state the total number of secondary school Academies and pupil population to which each annual total relates.

We can confirm that the department holds information that you have asked for in relation to the above. However, the information is exempt under section 21 of the FOI Act because it is reasonably accessible to you, and I am pleased to inform you that you can access it on our website via the following links:

<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10350&p=0>

<http://www.wolverhampton.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=10459&p=0>

Section 21(1) of the Freedom of Information Act exempts disclosure of information that is reasonably accessible by other means, and the terms of the exemption mean that we do not have to consider whether or not it would be in the public interest for you to have the information.

You can find out more about Section 21 by reading the extract from the Act, available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/36/section/21>

2. For each academic year: Of those pupils, whom Academies (secondary level) reported to have permanently excluded in your area (Q1), in relation to how many pupils did their parents apply for review by an independent review panel (IRP)?

There was 1 in 2014-2015

3. For each academic year: Of those pupils' formal permanent exclusions reviewed by IRPs (Q2), how many reviews were determined in favour of the pupil?

None.

4. For each academic year: Of those reviews determined in favour of the pupil (Q3), in relation to how many pupils did the IRP direct reconsideration by the Academy proprietor?

N/A

5. For each academic year: Of those reviews determined in favour of the pupil in relation to which the IRP directed reconsideration by the Academy proprietor (Q4), in relation to how many pupils did the IRP order that the Academy proprietor should make a £4,000 payment (in addition to funding that would usually follow the pupil) to you, the LA, towards the costs of finding alternative

education for that pupil, should the excluding Academy proprietor either  
(a) uphold the exclusion despite that direction, and/or  
(b) fail to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the IRP ordered (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

6. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the IRP ordered that, should the school uphold the exclusion despite the direction to the Academy proprietor to reconsider and/or fail to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations, the Academy proprietor should make a £4,000 payment to you, the LA (Q5), in relation to how many pupils did the £4,000 payment become due, and was it because the excluding Academy proprietor either  
(a) upheld the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or  
(b) failed to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the payment became due because of reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

7. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the £4,000 payment to you, the LA, became due (Q6), in relation to how many pupils did you, the LA, receive the £4,000 payment from the Academy proprietor as a result of the excluding Academy proprietor either  
(a) upholding the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or  
(b) failing to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the Academy proprietor made the payment to you because of reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

8. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the £4,000 payment to you, the LA, became due (Q6), in relation to how many pupils did you, the LA, take steps against the Academy proprietor to enforce the £4,000 payment, and had the payment become due because the excluding Academy proprietor either  
(a) upheld the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or  
(b) failed to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the non-payment you took steps to enforce had become due because of reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

9. For each academic year: Of those pupils' reviews in relation to which the

£4,000 payment to you, the LA, became due (Q6), in relation to how many pupils did you, the LA, report non-payment to the Education Funding Agency, and had the payment become due because the excluding Academy proprietor either

- (a) upheld the exclusion despite the direction to reconsider, and/or
- (b) failed to reconsider the exclusion within the time limit specified in the regulations?

Please specify your answer for (a) and (b) in relation to each pupil, so that it is clear whether, for a particular pupil, the reported non-payment had become due because of reason (a) only, (b) only, or both (a) and (b).

N/A

10. For each academic year: Of those payments of £4,000 you, the LA, received from Academy proprietors (Q7), in relation to how many pupils did you pass on the £4,000 to that pupil's new education provider?

For each pupil in relation to whom you passed on the £4,000 payment, please specify the nature of the new education provider and whether the pupil had been found a place at that new provider before or after the excluding Academy proprietor decided to uphold its decision to exclude.

N/A