

# REVIEW OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES (SEBD) IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

## Introduction

1. The County Council has a statutory duty to keep under review its arrangements for special educational provision, including its arrangements for SEBD. The importance of arrangements for pupils with SEBD has been recognised both nationally, through Charlie Taylor, the Government's expert adviser on behaviour and locally through attempts to strike an appropriate balance between provision and associated costs for this very vulnerable group of young people. It has therefore been agreed that SEBD should be the sole focus of the current statutory review of SEN and inclusion.
2. The review began in April 2012 and was completed in September 2012. This report describes the process, the consultation exercise undertaken with stakeholders and the outcomes from the review. It also recommends proposals for a new SEBD strategy for Nottinghamshire.

## Background

3. There are a number of pressures currently facing schools and the County Council in relation to the cost and effectiveness of existing arrangements in Nottinghamshire for children and young people with SEBD. These key pressures include:
  - increasing costs of Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and specialist placements and the corresponding impact on the budgets of all schools
  - a lack of locally available specialist SEBD provision
  - the changing relationship between the County Council and schools in the context of the changing status of schools (academies and free schools) and the changing role of the County Council
  - the recent reconfiguration of the behaviour and attendance service and the new requirement for the PRU to focus on short stay provision
  - changes to statutory duties in relation to alternative provision
  - the reform of funding arrangements for schools including PRUs
  - a need to provide a positive climate for learning for all children and young people
  - a perceived increase in the challenging behaviour of very young children
  - the requirement for schools to maintain standards of achievement and standards of behaviour in accordance with the new OFSTED framework.
4. The vision for the Children, Families and Cultural Services Department is that:

“We want Nottinghamshire to be a place where children are safe, healthy and happy, where everyone enjoys a good quality of life and everyone can achieve their potential”
5. This vision includes those young people who have been the focus of the SEBD review and applies equally to this very vulnerable group of learners. In order to fulfil this vision, it is recognised that we need to reconfigure and enhance arrangements within the resources available. At the time of the review it was estimated that the

County Council spends circa £10 million on the education of 380 pupils with SEBD in a range of settings.

6. We understand that a significant proportion (circa 40%) of these 380 pupils comes from troubled family backgrounds and it is timely that the Government has launched a Troubled Families project. The Troubled Families Project (TFP) is a three year initiative aimed at improving the quality of coordination between partner services and agencies with the ultimate aim of delivering improved outcomes across the board. 'Troubled Families' are identified using national and local criteria, including pupils who have been permanently excluded, or who have had more than three fixed term exclusions, or whose school attendance is persistently below 85%, as well as other non-educational criteria, e.g. families engaged in anti-social behaviour in the community.
7. We recognise the importance of the advice of the Government's Expert Adviser on Behaviour, Charlie Taylor, who published a paper entitled "Improving Alternative Provision" in which he states that:

"It is important to note that many children who are referred to Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) and Alternative Provision (AP) come from the most deprived backgrounds. They often come from chaotic homes in which problems such as drinking, drug taking, mental health issues, domestic violence and family breakdown are common. These children are often stuck in complex patterns of negative, self-destructive behaviour and helping them is not easy or formulaic. Many also have developed mental health issues. To break down these patterns they need the time, effort and commitment and expertise of dedicated professionals working in well-organised, well-resourced and responsive systems."
8. Although not all children with SEBD come from the backgrounds described above, it is our intention to heed Charlie Taylor's advice and establish a strategy which will deliver the necessary change.

## Understanding SEBD

9. Challenging behaviour in children is best understood not as a need in itself, but as a consequence of unmet needs. These may be unmet social and emotional needs, unmet communication needs, unmet physical and sensory needs, or unmet learning needs. The psychology service suggests that the following principles underpin our understanding about behaviour:
  - children do well if they can; children behave well if they can
  - behaviour can change. Positive, pro-social behaviour can be learned
  - behaviour does not occur in a vacuum, and its meaning can only be understood within the context in which it occurs
  - behaviour is something that people **do**, and is not what people **are**
  - the behaviour of children is often closely linked to the expectations of adults.
10. Analysis of our visits to other settings indicates that there are many ways of supporting pupils with SEBD. Our own review of good practice across the County highlighted some highly successful interventions that have prevented vulnerable pupils from being excluded. We found that the most successful were home grown,

locally owned solutions, involving schools and outside agencies working together to address individual difficulties. We identified four key features:

- a focus on inclusion rather than exclusion
- the involvement of parents and carers
- the value of a nurturing environment
- with a focus on individual learner progress.

11. Schools where pupils' behaviour is best usually have a strong nurturing environment and exclusions are very rare. Such environments help vulnerable children because teachers provide settings and encouragement for them to become purposefully and fully engaged in activities. Children are helped to make discoveries and connections between experiences so that they can make sense of the world. Activities help them to interact productively with their peers. The earlier children have such experiences, the quicker they make progress. Children with SEBD may need help to resolve the social and emotional issues that are causing challenging behaviour before they can begin to make academic progress.

12. In the 2011-12 academic year, there were 122 permanent exclusions from primary and secondary schools in Nottinghamshire, which represents 0.11 % of the number of pupils in schools (11 pupils in every 10,000). Permanent exclusions from secondary schools were vastly more common (91.8%) than in primary schools (8.2%). It is higher in some districts than others: in Spring 2011-12, it was highest in Bassetlaw (32 permanent exclusions) and lowest in Newark (6 permanent exclusions). The rate of permanent exclusions for pupils with SEN is increasing in Nottinghamshire. Compared with the previous year the number of permanent exclusions has increased by 0.01% i.e. 12 more permanent exclusions. The main reason for exclusion is persistent disruptive behaviour. There were no exclusions from special schools. The pupils who are excluded are much more likely to:

- be boys, especially White British
- have special educational needs
- be entitled to free school meals
- be in Key Stage 4.

13. The SEBD review has covered learners on a spectrum of behaviours, from those pupils who might be considered to be mildly disruptive in mainstream schools to those who are at the other end of the spectrum, with severe and complex social and emotional behavioural difficulties that require highly specialist interventions.

## **Review process**

14. The review process was initiated in April 2012 and has involved:

- the establishment of a steering group
- the production of a report describing the national context
- a review of Nottinghamshire's PRU provision
- visits to other local authority provision by officers and head teachers and the identification of common themes arising from high quality provision
- the establishment of pilot projects in Mansfield, Ashfield, Gedling and Rushcliffe

- research into examples of good practice across Nottinghamshire, resulting in the production of a compendium of case studies
  - a financial analysis of district spend on SEBD arrangements
  - three consultation events and outcomes from this consultation
  - 'deep dives' into Alternative Provision funded through High Level Needs (HLN) allocations undertaken by members of the High Level Needs panel.
15. The outcomes of the review process have culminated in the collation of a bank of evidence that supports the need to change the model of provision currently available in Nottinghamshire. There was a strong consensus that retaining the status quo is not an option.
16. During the consultation process three groups of learners with SEBD were considered:
- learners who can be managed in mainstream settings with appropriate arrangements in place (*it is proposed that their needs will be met by developing the capacity of all schools to manage pupils with SEBD*)
  - learners requiring alternative provision either in the PRU or through external providers (*it is proposed that their needs will be met by strengthening the local partnership offer*)
  - learners requiring specialist provision in specialist environments (*it is proposed that their needs will be met by securing high quality specialist provision*)
17. The outcomes of the review will need to describe the basis of the offer for these groups of learners. The review has focussed on the following five main questions:
- 1) What can we expect from all schools?
  - 2) What can we expect from partnerships of schools?
  - 3) What is the role of the PRU?
  - 4) What specialist provision should we make?
  - 5) What is the role of the County Council and its partners?
18. These questions were raised with a variety of stakeholders throughout the review process. In answering these questions, stakeholders identified five steps for establishing collective responsibility in order to deliver the required changes. These steps represent significant changes to the offer which will be made by:
1. all schools
  2. partnerships of schools
  3. specialist providers
  4. the Pupil Referral Unit
  5. the County Council

19. The outcomes of the review are described below.

### **Outcomes of the review process: common themes**

20. Following the debate at the conference events a number of common themes were identified across all districts which will help to shape future provision. These themes were also evident in arrangements which were examined and observed in other local

authorities where the provision was considered to be highly effective. These themes included the need for:

- early intervention and effective co-ordination of key early intervention services
- high level of parental involvement at earlier stages
- nurturing environments across all phases
- flexibility in the curriculum
- home/school liaison workers
- therapeutic interventions for children and families
- an effective training and professional development programme
- effective and collaborative SEBD partnerships
- an agreed charging mechanism for the cost of Alternative Provision for schools which opt out of partnership working
- increased devolution of resources and responsibilities to schools and partnerships
- strong links between schools and the PRU
- availability of short term placements at the PRU without the need for permanent exclusions
- effective transition between phases
- cost effective, high quality SEBD provision.

21. In order to reshape provision, schools were asked which model of service delivery they preferred.

22. Schools were asked to express a preference from the following options:

1. to continue the current model of delivery where the County Council commissions provision and services on behalf of schools
2. to delegate resources to individual school budgets so that schools are able to commission provision from their own funds
3. to devolve resources to partnerships of schools for collaborative approaches i.e. partnerships of schools would determine provision for pupils within their community.

23. The majority view was in favour of option 3 i.e. partnership working between the LA and school partnerships. However, a small number of schools preferred a hybrid of options 2 and 3. A further smaller minority of schools preferred option 2, where resources would be delegated to individual schools in order that they could make their own decisions and own provision.

24. Taking account of these options and emerging themes, together with the advice and evidence collected throughout the consultation process, including external evaluations of national and local provision, it is recommended that the following new arrangements should be implemented.

### **Recommendations: Five Steps to Collective Responsibility**

25. There are a number of key partners with responsibility for this vulnerable group of learners. These partners will need to subscribe to a notion of collective responsibility in which all have a part to play in bringing about improvements in provision across Nottinghamshire. We believe that the measures required to bring about the

necessary change can be described as five steps to collective responsibility as follows:

### **Step 1: Developing the capacity of all schools to manage pupils with SEBD**

#### ***This is what we heard***

26. Currently a variety of practice is in place in relation to SEBD arrangements across mainstream schools (academies and maintained schools). Throughout the review process, we explored examples of existing good practice across Nottinghamshire schools. We also became aware that schools operate different thresholds of tolerance and flexibility in the arrangements that they make. We also became aware that schools operate different thresholds of tolerance and flexibility in the arrangements they make in relation to acceptable levels of behaviour.
27. In order to develop a positive climate for learning, schools need to enhance their capacity to manage behaviour in school and in particular to manage children with SEBD. The review process identified a number of positive initiatives which are worthy of further consideration by all schools. These initiatives have usually been met from resources normally available within school which include funding for Additional School Needs (ASN), Additional Family Needs (AFN) and High Level Needs (HLN) and the pupil premium allocation.

#### ***This is what we propose schools should do***

28. At the recent conference events, primary head teachers indicated that our priority should be to further support the capacity of primary schools to meet the needs of their more challenging pupils (as an alternative to creating other options that could involve children having to travel some distance from home).
29. At the same conferences, secondary head teachers and their representatives indicated a willingness to promote a positive agenda around improving pupil engagement which should be shared by all school staff.
30. It is proposed that Nottinghamshire schools should expand their core offer by sharing aspects of good practice across schools in order to help to raise standards and remove the need for exclusions.

Best practice suggests that schools should ensure the following approaches are in place:

- identifying a lead professional for behaviour in each school, who can develop more specific skills in this area
- holding frequent and accurate reviews of each pupil's progress with the full involvement of parents
- identifying early and accurately the most vulnerable pupils and those in danger of disengagement
- working closely and productively with families through structured conversations
- having in place a variety of well-focused, short-term interventions that are evaluated before looking for solutions outside the school

- extending the range of effective strategies for engaging White British boys, those from the most deprived and troubled families and those with special educational needs
- increasing the confidence and skills of teachers in behaviour management
- having in place systems to monitor how well individual needs are met in all lessons and accurate assessments of progress
- having targets for reducing exclusions and improving attendance, if necessary
- disseminating innovative practice regarding relationships with outside agencies
- extending our behaviour network activities so that primary schools can share good practice (for example, nurturing practices and more structured approaches to parental engagement)
- identifying alternatives to sending pupils home during fixed term exclusions
- identifying strategies for schools to retain responsibility for any excluded pupils.
- establishing nurturing environments in all schools particularly at Key Stages 1 and 2
- ensuring that enhanced arrangements are put in place at key transition stages for children with SEBD and that secondary schools consider establishing nurturing arrangements at Key Stage 3
- retaining accountability for the outcomes of learners and the re-engagement of those pupils who receive their education off site
- sharing positive practice identified in the review case studies
- strengthening the links with the targeted support that is currently provided through the new Primary Social Emotional Development Team (PSED) Team, the County Council's Early Years and Early Intervention Team, the Targeted Services Team and the Troubled Families team.

31. Many schools will recognise aspects from the above list, others may find it helpful when developing priorities for school improvement.

## **Step 2: Strengthening the local partnership offer**

### ***This is what we heard***

32. In 2008 the Department for Education (DfE) published 'Back on track', a White Paper designed to improve outcomes for vulnerable young people. It included the recommendation to establish secondary school behaviour partnerships. This requirement has since been revoked but has left a legacy of effective partnership working in some districts and some local authorities.
33. As part of the review process, a small working party of head teachers and officers spent some time visiting other local authorities where partnership working was seen to bring about positive change for young people with SEBD. In some local authorities funding has been delegated to local partnerships. In others, partnerships of schools were encouraged to take part in decision making processes. These arrangements enabled local decision making, a better use of resources and the establishment of collective responsibility where schools retained ownership of all children within their communities.
34. In Nottinghamshire four pilot projects have been exploring the benefits of effective partnership working. These have been in primary partnerships (Rushcliffe, Ashfield and Mansfield) and secondary partnerships (Mansfield and Ashfield). These projects

have demonstrated reductions in exclusions, increased pupil attendance and increased confidence of staff in managing children with SEBD.

***This is what we propose partnerships should do***

35. In the light of the evidence gathered during the review, it is proposed that our future strategy will encourage the further development of partnership working. The partnership working will involve the development of the relationship between groups of schools (primary and secondary), the PRU and the County Council. Over time this will result in increasing devolution of resources to partnerships of schools.
36. Underpinning the development of partnerships will be the desire to develop a new approach for the provision of services for pupils who have been excluded or who are at risk of exclusion. This will include the development of specific approaches according to key stages as described below:
  - **Early Years/Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2** – alternatives to PRU provision will be identified and provided in mainstream school settings
  - **Key Stage 3** – specialist turnaround provision will be established within the PRU through strong collaboration with schools and partnerships of schools
  - **Key Stage 4/5** – resources will be devolved to partnerships in order that they may commission or provide appropriate alternative provision.
37. School partnerships will make a key contribution to our future strategy for behaviour in Nottinghamshire. This will include supporting local professional networks, collective commissioning (and an increasing role in the management) of provision and services, and a greater role in quality assurance and review.
38. There are a range of options for school groupings. However, we are keen to encourage partnerships that are area-linked. In most cases, schools already work together at district level and we see strong benefits in maintaining this approach. Broxtowe and Ashfield work slightly differently (with three secondary partnerships: North Ashfield, South Broxtowe and 'SHENK'<sup>1</sup>). We will consult with primary schools about alignment to these areas.
39. From experience in Nottinghamshire and elsewhere, we see considerable advantages to partnerships operating on a cross-phase basis. This will allow increasing priority to be given to early intervention and effective school phase transitions.
40. We see partnerships as playing an important role in providing mutual support and capacity-building. However, we want to move towards greater devolution of our budgets for behaviour provision and services to partnership level. We plan to meet with primary and secondary representatives from each partnership area to consider how this might happen.

---

\*At the time of establishing the School Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships (SBAPs), a group of schools felt that a strong collaboration already existed to support developments in the South Ashfield and Broxtowe Districts. 'SHENK' (Selston, Holgate, Eastwood, National and Kimberley schools) joined together in a collaborative approach to manage the needs of pupils with challenging behaviour in the district.



41. Our initial view is that we should begin this process for provision at KS4. It is proposed that funding for KS4 will be devolved to school partnerships on the basis of a formal Service Level Agreement (SLA). Notional shares will be identified on the basis of (a) agreed indicators of area need and (b) the agreed share of the overall PRU budget that needs to be focused on this key stage. Our data analysis shows that current use of provision in some areas is higher than expected. Some areas commit a far greater proportion of their overall 'spend' on provision for older pupils, whereas others invest more in early intervention.
42. The approach to devolution will be discussed with each partnership. We would prefer to devolve at the partnership level, as this provides greater flexibility and economies of scale and enhances a sense of collective responsibility. Schools working together at this level will receive additional financial support in recognition of this activity. Some partnerships may ask for devolution to occur at the individual school level. This will be possible. However, schools should understand that they will be expected to fund alternative provision for all KS4 pupils from this source (including those that are permanently excluded). The SLA will indicate how much schools will have to pay if the County Council has to arrange provision on their behalf.
43. The County Council will work to assist partnerships in their 'progression plan'. Consideration will need to be given as to how funding/capacity at KS4 can be released to support the development/enhancement of local alternatives. This will involve:
  - (i) predicting when pupils from the partnership area will leave PRU/other specialist provision and when money/spaces will become available
  - (ii) identifying potential existing pupils that partnerships could take back into a more local halfway house facility
  - (iii) clarifying how the partnership might move from existing spend to expected share.
44. The County Council will also work to support the development of local partnership activity by:
  - (i) helping schools to develop local options
  - (ii) supporting processes for collective quality assurance and outcome analysis
  - (iii) helping to establish processes for prioritisation of cases
  - (iv) developing an approved provider framework for alternative provision from a range of providers through a quality assured competitive tendering process;
45. Opportunities will be considered to transfer to partnerships, resources, responsibilities and accountability for children with SEBD. This will involve the establishment of social enterprise initiatives whereby it may be possible for partnerships to develop local options which generate savings which can be re-invested in early intervention approaches. In the first instance, the local authority will provide appropriate officer support to facilitate this development in each partnership. The partnership will be responsible for:
  - managing district partnership budgets and deployment of resources
  - reaching local decisions in relation to expenditure, placements and development of Alternative Provision
  - developing programmes of Continuous Professional Development (CPD)

- developing an SEBD strategy for each partnership
- identifying a range of appropriate cost effective alternative provision
- reviewing the placements of pupils who live in their districts who receive their education in alternative or independent non-maintained provision
- operating the fair access panel
- quality assuring off site alternative provision
- developing effective CPD arrangements for teachers and teaching assistants, which includes knowledge and understanding of good practice across the district
- allocating district resources based on quality data and evidence
- linking with early support and early intervention and targeted support services and the troubled families project
- ensuring provision within 5 days of the issue of a permanent exclusion for pupils in Key Stage 4.

46. The County Council will support these arrangements by:

- providing a locality based area officer to facilitate the development of the partnership and support the implementation of the Fair Access Protocol
- establishing a preferred provider framework for approved alternative provision providers
- offering the advice of a fair access officer to support the management of placements of pupils who are vulnerable and who have additional levels of complexity
- providing a PRU partnership co-ordinator to facilitate admissions to the PRU and provide support to the partnership to develop arrangements for Alternative Provision.

### **Step 3: Defining the role of the PRU**

47. Currently, Nottinghamshire's PRU is a County Council service that is registered with the Department for Education as a single pupil referral unit. The PRU is divided into three sites and is known as 'The Learning Centre' (TLC) and falls within the scope of the school framework for Ofsted inspections. The outcome of the recent Ofsted inspection judged the provision to be satisfactory (with some good features).

48. An external consultant was commissioned to evaluate the effectiveness of the service delivered by the PRU. The consultant made a number of recommendations which included the need for:

- a clear description of the role of the PRU
- schools to provide more information about individual pupils before entry to the PRU
- detailed tracking and monitoring and the impact of teaching on pupil progress
- extending the repertoire of strategies to meet pupils' needs
- enhancing staff leadership skills
- providing peer counselling for staff
- joint planning with pupils
- enriching the curriculum with other activities and therapies
- supporting families through collaborative working with other LA services and partners

- providing CPD for mainstream colleagues.
49. The review process has explored national and local models of PRU provision. Visits to PRUs in other local authorities have also been undertaken by a team of head teachers and a County Council officer. The findings from these visits would suggest that strong links between the PRU and schools or partnerships of schools enhanced positive working relationships and facilitated a notion of collective responsibility for pupils with SEBD. These effective relationships involved:
- reaching joint decisions about PRU placements and other types of provision
  - developing “turnaround” strategies with cooperation from schools to reintegrate into mainstream
  - determining placements without the need to exclude
  - exploring a range of alternative options
  - establishing mechanisms for quality assurance of alternative provision
  - establishing protocols, service level agreements and contractual arrangements.

**This is what we propose to do**

50. The existing Learning Centre will be divided into three separate PRUs serving different ‘bands’ of the County i.e.:
- North: Bassetlaw and Newark partnerships  
 Central: Mansfield, North Ashfield and SHENK (South Ashfield and North Broxtowe)  
 South: Rushcliffe, Gedling, South Broxtowe
51. Management committees will be formed for each new PRU, in line with DfE guidance, to include strong mainstream school partnership representation.
52. From April 2013, the PRUs will be financed through a combination of ‘place’ funding and ‘service’ funding. Place funding will be used to fund KS2 & KS3 pupil placements at the PRU in the first instance. Service funding will be provided to support a more flexible approach to provision for KS4 students, as well as a defined capacity to support outreach/reintegration.
53. Funding for KS4 will be devolved to school partnerships on the basis of a formal Service Level Agreement. Notional shares will be identified on the basis of:
- (a) agreed indicators of area need
  - (b) the agreed share of the overall PRU budget that needs to be focused on this key stage.
54. Our data analysis shows that current use of provision in some areas is higher than expected. Some areas commit a far greater proportion of their overall ‘spend’ on provision for older pupils, whereas others invest more in early intervention.

**PRU provision:**

55. It is expected that, in future, the main focus of PRU provision will be on pupils at KS3. There will be a new approach to provision for such pupils, with PRU placements being part of a positive and proactive plan to engage/re-engage those who are at significant risk of permanent exclusion. Representatives from school partnerships will

work more closely with the County Council/the PRUs to determine priorities for admission. Plans will be based on the following options:

- (i) short-term placement to support re-engagement at existing school
- (ii) short-term placement to support successful transfer to new school (same phase/next phase)
- (iii) a period of assessment to enable more detailed consideration of next stage, including the possibility of a more individualised programme or specialist placement (in a small number of cases).

56. It is expected that this more proactive approach will reduce the need for permanent exclusion, particularly where children have a known history of social, emotional and behaviour difficulties (and services have already been involved).
57. The contribution of the PRUs to KS4 provision may vary across the County, at the initial stages. We would expect school partnerships to take increasing responsibility for arranging alternative provision for this age group, and this might involve developing their own local options.
58. The County Council will work with schools and PRU managers to address the Human Resources (HR) and financial implications of this trend. Some partnerships/schools may wish to use their devolved budgets to continue to buy into PRU provision for KS4 pupils (while they explore the potential for other options). An alternative 'halfway house' model could involve PRU staff being 'outposted' to partnerships to help develop and manage local provision. This will be discussed in more detail with each partnership.

#### **Longer-term future:**

59. As the implementation of the strategy progresses, we will review the balance of place plus and service funding. We would anticipate that, over time, we would be likely to move towards a more flexible (service) approach, with an increasing level of devolution of resources to local partnerships. However, the County Council will also need to consider what type of provision it will need to make for those children with very significant and complex needs, who may require more specialist/tailor-made options. It is possible that the PRUs may play a local coordinating role in this area.

#### **Step 4: Improving the quality of specialist provision**

##### ***This is what we heard***

60. Nottinghamshire does not maintain any local specialist SEBD provision. Instead it purchases provision from other local authorities, alternative providers or independent non-maintained specialist schools. At the time of the review there were:

- 20 pupils attending other LA special schools
- 22 pupils attending independent non-maintained special schools
- 64 pupils receiving education from alternative providers.

This education is provided at a total cost of about £3 million for 106 learners.

61. During the consultation process, a number of schools were surprised at the significant costs associated with this model of service delivery and asked whether

this could be delivered in a more cost effective manner through local authority maintained provision.

### **This is what we propose to do**

62. The County Council is therefore proposing that a continuum of provision is developed to include specialist SEBD provision. A feasibility study will be undertaken to determine whether Nottinghamshire should:
- develop a mixed economy of specialist SEBD provision, which includes locally managed, small-scale SEBD provision *or* establish a local SEBD special school *or*
  - continue to purchase placements from other local authority special schools or independent non-maintained schools *or*
  - promote the establishment of a specialist free school or independent SEBD school *or*
  - enhance the offer made by Nottinghamshire's existing special schools.

The County Council should establish a preferred provider framework for specialist SEBD provision in the independent non-maintained sector.

### **Step 5: Defining the role of the County Council**

63. At a broader level, we want to work with schools to promote a more positive agenda around improving pupil engagement - a shared enterprise in which all school staff and services share responsibility for achieving the best possible outcomes for some of the most vulnerable young people in our community.
64. The County Council's role has been described in previous 'steps' in this document but in summary it will be responsible for:
- developing a framework of approved providers of Alternative Provision
  - commissioning a feasibility study of the benefits of establishing a local specialist SEBD School
  - establishing a PSED team (Primary Social Emotional Development team)
  - extending the development of a supportive network for named behaviour lead professionals in schools
  - providing support and challenge to the development of partnerships of schools
  - allocating a named Local Based Area Officer to each district partnership to facilitate the development of the partnership and support the implementation of the Fair Access Protocol
  - allocating a PRU Partnership Co-ordinator to facilitate admissions to the PRU and support for alternative provision arrangements within the district partnerships
  - offering the advice of a Fair Access Officer. The officer will support the management of placements of pupils who are vulnerable and who have additional levels of complexity and need
  - developing a mechanism for devolving resources to partnerships of schools
  - developing a system of incentives (include and reward) and disincentives (exclude and pay the costs) in order to minimise exclusions
  - providing regular feedback to the Schools Forum on expenditure for these arrangements

- developing a phased implementation plan in order to bring about the required change.

## **Conclusion**

65. The recommendations contained within this report have arisen from extensive research into national practice, visits to other local authorities, collation of national and local data and consultation with stakeholders including schools, the PRU, parents and children and young people with SEBD.
66. It is recognised that this is a complex area of provision which provides a high degree of challenge for schools and local authorities both nationally as well as locally. As such, a number of different solutions will be required at different key stages of the national curriculum.
67. The proposed new strategy, '5 steps to collective responsibility', will be implemented in a phased approach which will require the commitment of all partners including the County Council. In order to implement the strategy, the County Council will establish a number of working groups with a focus on:
  - procuring alternative provision
  - developing effective partnerships
  - providing support to schools
  - developing the PRU provision
  - undertaking a feasibility study of specialist SEBD provision
  - considering human resource implications
  - considering financial implications and devolution of resources

## **Recommendations**

68. That the Children and Young People's Committee:
  - approves the outcomes of the SEBD review as described in this report
  - approves the new strategy for SEBD arrangements; '5 steps to collective responsibility'
  - approves the development of a phased implementation plan in order to deliver the new arrangements described in this report.