



8 December 2014

Agenda Item: 04

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION STANDARDS AND INCLUSION

IMPACT OF THE NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

Purpose of the Report

1. To inform Members of the Children and Young People's Committee of the impact of the new arrangements for children and young people with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) in Nottinghamshire.

Information and Advice

Background

2. On 10 February 2014, the County Council approved a new approach to meeting the needs of children and young people with SEBD. As a result of this new approach, the County Council has incrementally devolved resources to behaviour partnerships of schools. The intention has been that partnerships and schools will increasingly establish a new set of arrangements that will better meet the needs of young people at risk of permanent exclusion as a result of their behaviour.
3. This report evaluates the effectiveness of this strategy and considers four features of development which can be used as indicators of success:
 - 1) number of permanent exclusions
 - 2) number of signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) between the County Council and partnerships of schools and the growth in partnership activity
 - 3) the level of engagement of young people in alternative provision, including case studies of those attending alternative provision
 - 4) information gathered from the Quality Assurance of alternative providers.

Feature 1: Numbers of permanent exclusions

4. The number of young people permanently excluded from school has dramatically reduced as shown in **Table 1** overleaf. September 2014 was the first time when there were no permanent exclusions in a calendar month from any school in Nottinghamshire. Three exclusions occurred in October which were from secondary schools, and there were no

exclusions from primary schools. Two of the excluded secondary aged pupils were resident in Nottinghamshire, the other was a Nottingham city resident and the provision put in place as a result of his exclusion will be made by the City Council. In November 2014 three exclusions have occurred. One of these pupils is resident in Nottinghamshire and the remaining two are resident in Nottingham city.

5. There has been an increased dialogue between the County Council's partnership development officers and head teachers of secondary schools where a risk of a permanent exclusion has been identified. Partnerships have been encouraged to consider alternatives and resources have been devolved to them in order to make alternative arrangements. The implementation of the Behaviour Strategy has led to a healthy dialogue between schools and the officers concerned which has enabled the exploration of more positive alternatives for young people.

Table 1: permanent exclusions from Nottinghamshire Schools

	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Total
09/2014 to 07/2015	0	3	3									6
09/2013 to 07/2014	5	4	12	4	7	3	6	4	5	1	8	59
09/2012 to 07/2013	3	12	14	12	6	9	10	6	2	11	5	90
09/2011 to 07/2012	15	10	14	9	10	11	16	4	16	7	6	118
09/2010 to 07/2011	12	13	14	5	8	14	18	7	13	14	10	128
09/2009 to 07/2010	11	13	14	15	12	7	15	9	14	11	9	130
09/2008 to 07/2009	11	19	14	9	22	16	16	7	13	23	6	156
09/2007 to 07/2008	12	17	14	14	21	14	15	15	15	18	10	165
09/2006 to 07/2007	11	12	14	13	13	17	12	10	6	14	13	135
09/2005 to 07/2006	12	12	14	17	24	11	15	4	23	20	8	160
09/2004 to 07/2005	15	19	14	10	8	10	6	23	12	18	6	141
09/2003 to 07/2004	10	20	19	13	23	13	22	9	13	11	11	164
09/2002 to 07/2003	18	14	8	11	17	13	12	9	18	20	7	147

6. Where schools exclude over and above agreed levels of permanent exclusions as described in the Memorandum of Understanding, the County Council established a system to charge the excluding schools a contribution to the cost of the provision made by the County Council on schools' behalf. This is known as the cost recovery mechanism (CRM). From September 2013 to September 2014, the CRM mechanism was initiated 10 times and recovered £81,000 from five schools which excluded over the agreed level. Five of the 10 cases came from one school. Consideration may need to be given to either an increased level of CRM or a sliding scale of CRM whereby the more pupils a school excludes, the higher the CRM.

Feature 2: The number of signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) between the County Council and Schools Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships (SBAPs) and subsequent growth in partnership activity once financial resources has transferred

7. All primary SBAPs have signed the MOU, and as a result funding has been transferred across to them. Two secondary academy Trusts have not yet signed: Redhill Academy and Outwood Grange (Portland and Valley Schools). There are ongoing discussions with these Trusts.

8. The partnership development officers have provided reports on each of the partnerships. The following are highlights from these reports:

Primary partnerships

9. Each primary behaviour partnership has a primary lead, usually a head teacher. The primary leads have signed the MOU on behalf of their partnerships. In some cases this has been supported by individual head teachers signing a local agreement to support the principles of cooperation. All allocated funding has been devolved to the partnerships. The Local Authority's support service for primary school is called the Primary Social Emotional Development team (PSED). Members of the PSED team have been allocated to partnerships and are now embedded within those partnerships. Their aim is to support the development of their partnerships and manage referrals for those pupils at imminent risk of exclusion. These arrangements are managed through locally agreed protocols. The majority of the PSED team members have a designated office space in a partnership school which is used as a central base.
10. Primary Behaviour Partnerships are at varied stages of development. Newark Town has a well-established partnership and has used some of the devolved resources to employ a lead member of staff. The behaviour partnership has established a wide range of interventions to meet the needs of pupils identified as being at risk of exclusion. In other areas partnership working had to be developed from scratch. Bassetlaw and schools in Selston, Hucknall, Eastwood, National and Kimberley, known as the SHENK partnership, held their launch events in November where head teachers, SENCOs and behaviour leads heard the key messages agreed by their strategic planning groups.
11. The following is a summary of current interventions for those pupils at risk of exclusion supported and/or funded by Primary Behaviour Partnerships:
 - there are now eight Nurture Groups in primary partnerships. The Treehouse at Forest Town Primary School has received accreditation from the Nurture Network. Nurture Networks are taking place in all partnerships supported by the PSED team
 - targeted group work led by PSED team members in partnership with staff from local Children's Centres including 'Big Bag of Emotions' and 'Non-violent Resistance' workshops for parents
 - targeted group activities funded by the partnerships including Boot Camp, Sports Skills Group, Martial Arts Support (co-ordinated by Extended Services links) and Positive Futures
 - Targeted Group work funded by an individual school but offered to partnership schools including play therapy and art based activities
 - CASY Counselling has been made available for individual identified pupils
 - partnership training delivered by the PSED team including assessment techniques and profiling systems, understanding ADHD, mid-day supervisor training, Breakwell Assault, Managing Emotions and training for newly qualified teachers and teaching assistants. Several partnerships offer a menu of training opportunities that partnership members can freely access
 - some partnerships have used their resources to employ additional staff such as: a Specialist TA/Community Worker, play therapist/counsellor Other types of staff employed by partnerships include a Teaching Assistant Liaison Officer, Teaching

Assistants, Family Support Workers, a Partnership Behaviour Lead and a Behaviour Teacher.

- alternative provision is available from 'First Class', 'REAL' and 'Hilltops'
- cover for Family SENCOs is available to develop protocols as a new partnership develops.

12. There is much early evidence of the impact of these interventions. Feedback from Partnerships demonstrates that:

- there is a raised awareness of the need for schools to work together
- the SBAP has provided a key central point for access to advice and support which enables schools to provide the best possible support for both children and their carers
- family SENCOs are benefiting from close working and sharing good practice and knowledge
- partnerships are working together to agree a graduated response at school level through the peer moderation of referrals for additional support
- communication is more effective between schools, Extended Services, Early Years Specialist Teachers, Early Years SEND, PSED team and Children's Centres so that appropriate information is shared across all agencies involved with the child and their family.

Secondary partnerships

13. Highlights from each of the partnerships include:

South Broxtowe

The partnership schools meet on a regular basis to develop provision and plan for individual pupils. The partnership is establishing a key stage 3 intervention base for nurture respite and "turn around" support. This will be located in a converted building on the site of one of the schools in the partnership.

Gedling (excludes Redhill Academy)

The partnership, known as the "4 G Network", meets regularly to find partnership solutions including managed moves and shared isolation. The partnership is seeking expressions of interest from alternative providers to run a bespoke key stage 3 turnaround provision.

Redhill School has a separate partnership arrangement and negotiations are taking place which will make the transfer of funds to the school in order to establish its own alternative provision.

Rushcliffe

The heads of the Rushcliffe schools have agreed to share the partnership funds equally between them.

Each school will develop capacity to either manage young people internally or to use the funds to purchase suitable alternative provision externally. The schools suggest five pupils

who would have ordinarily been permanently excluded are having provision made for them in this way.

Toot Hill

Toot Hill School is not in a partnership but has signed the MOU and is in the stages of developing its own in house provision.

SHENK

The partnership has signed the MOU and put in place a graduated system for accessing additional resources. This has enabled 18 young people to access alternative provision out of school, and 10 young people are accessing in-school support from organisations such as "Commando Joe". SHENK is seeking to establish a turnaround provision in the next nine months.

Bassetlaw East (Elizabethan, Tuxford and Retford Oaks)

The partnership established the Ashvale Centre (see case studies 1 and 2 below). This provision is available to schools in the partnership and also for others who are prepared to buy places. There have been no permanent exclusions since April 2014 when the funding was transferred to the partnership.

Outwood Grange (Valley and Portland)

The partnership has yet to sign the MOU. The levels of exclusion within these schools remain high and the schools are incurring charges associated with cost recovery mechanism. There were 14 exclusions in 2013/14 and one exclusion has occurred so far in 2014/15.

Serlby Academy

Serlby has not entered into an agreement with schools in Nottinghamshire, but is in a partnership with schools in the same academy chain in Doncaster. The chain has opened a free school whose remit is to manage pupils at risk of exclusion as a result of their behaviour. They are utilising this resource effectively and have adopted a policy of no permanent exclusions. They have signed a MOU and are using their devolved resources to good effect.

The Dukeries

The Dukeries School is not in a partnership with other schools. However the school has signed the MOU and has used funds devolved to it to establish an inclusion base called "Success" which offers a flexible provision for those young people who require it. Each child attending "Success" has a personalised curriculum. It is working in collaboration with its family of primary schools and offered training and respite placements at "Success". There were no exclusions in 2013/14.

Newark Town Partnership (Magnus and Newark Academies)

The partnership has been proactive in developing a shared in-house provision called MAPLE. The provision offers tailor-made provision for young people at risk of exclusion. It has demonstrated success in increasing pupil engagement, and improved outcomes for learners who would have previously become disengaged from learning.

Schools in the Newark Town partnership are active participants in a Newark-wide District Fair Access Panel. These meetings are very positive and enable schools to manage move pupils across the district and across partnerships.

Joseph Whitaker and Minster School

These schools have entered into a partnership and have recently signed the MOU. Both schools are actively seeking alternatives to permanent exclusions. There were no exclusions from the two schools in 2013/14.

Mansfield

Mansfield has been established as a partnership for some time now and its arrangements are mature and continually developing. Samworth Academy, previously disengaged from the partnership, is now in the process of considering joining the arrangement. The partnership has established a limited company which includes the majority of Mansfield primaries as well as the secondary schools. The partnership has developed its own offsite provision called ALTEC, (alternative to exclusion), which is time limited provision and partnership funded and managed.

North Ashfield

This partnership is another well-established partnership. It offers a robust fair access panel and a well-established alternative provision called the Space Centre (see case study 3). This provision offers vocational opportunities to pupils in the partnership. The partnership has established a limited company to manage its affairs and has employed a staff of four full time employees. There were no permanent exclusions from this partnership in 2013/14.

Feature 3: The level of engagement of young people in alternative provision, and case studies of those attending alternative provision

14. The attendance of young people on alternative provision, who are not on the roll of a school, is monitored by the Local Authority. There are indications that the attendance rate for pupils attending alternative provision is improving. There are 18 pupils who attend alternative provision and who are not on the roll of a school. These placements are monitored by the Local Authority. The attendance rate for these pupils is 74.2%; these include five persistent absentees (two due to placement breakdown which should have now been resolved and their attendance rate should start to improve).
15. The following three case studies are provided as examples of how the new range of alternative provision developing across the majority of schools in Nottinghamshire is

providing a positive life changing opportunity for young people who previously were disengaged and “troubled” in a traditional school environment.

Case study 1

“Child A” is in Year 11 and attends the Ashvale Centre, which is the alternative provision managed by East Bassetlaw SBAP.

“A” had been involved in a number of serious incidents resulting in three fixed term exclusions, intervention from the police and a disengagement from school. When in school he was highly disruptive and had physically assaulted a number of other students. His mother handed in offensive weapons and drugs equipment to the police.

“A” was placed at the Ashvale Centre. He signed a behaviour agreement and began an intensive behaviour management programme. This included a visit to a prison in order to increase awareness of the consequence of anti-social activity.

He has participated in academic work in small groups and has engaged in a work placement.

He left school in July 2014 with 5 GCSE passes and has started an apprenticeship as a result of his successful work placement.

Case study 2

“Child B” experienced significant difficulties at primary school and had received several fixed term exclusions. On transfer to secondary school he received four further fixed term exclusions for anti-social behaviour, theft, sexualised behaviour and aggression. He was banned from the school bus. Various alternative providers were tried but he was banned from the provisions as a result of challenging and unsafe behaviour. Parents refused to cooperate with outside agencies.

He was offered a place at the Ashvale centre. Intensive behaviour management support was put in place. The consequences of his behaviours were explored with him, including a visit to the Magistrates Court. Academic teaching took place, first in a 1 to 1 situation then 2 to 1. A programme of reintegration back onto mainstream school took place. As a result “B” is now fully integrated back into mainstream school taking part in English, mathematics, science, construction and mechanics. The bus ban has been lifted.

Case study 3

“Child C” was in Year 10 in June 2014 having moved back into the area after living away for a year. He experienced difficulty accessing a school place on his return as he had posed significant challenges to schools prior to his move.

A placement at the SPACE centre was made as a way of preparing for his reintroduction back into school.

In discussions with “C” and his family it was recognised that he had in the past made poor choices and had to be more careful about the friendship groups and activities he chose

both in and out of school. This also allowed “C” to express his interest in certain subjects and allowed the SPACE team to allocate a place on appropriate programmes that would meet his needs.

A review in July reported back to SBAP that progress was good and that he was keen to get into school. At SPACE he accessed a motor vehicle course and proved to be a good example to others. He also accessed some 1 to1 provision at SPACE in English and mathematics with a new member of staff brought in to support this type of student/provision. During this time he excelled and provided work for his new school to review in advance of his arrival to allow for an appropriate placement within a specific teaching group.

A review of these experiences added to the evidence base for him to start some transition sessions at his new school earlier than planned. At this time a place also became available on the Tall Ships residential course which operated in conjunction with The YMCA and SPACE. This programme aimed at building self-esteem and through challenging activities in the weeks prior to the residential course considered factors that can lead to students becoming unemployable at 16, including behaviour, attendance, attitude and planning for the future.

Feedback from SPACE to the new school was essential to ensure that they were aware of activities being undertaken and progress being made. Feedback to “C’s” mum was also essential to ensure she was aware of progress, satisfied with the level of intervention and remained positive about her relationship with a new school.

“C” started his new school in July for several transition days, met with key pastoral and subject staff and then started full-time in September: he is currently on roll, attending well, achieving well academically and has had no issues with behaviour at all.

“C” has built new positive friendships at school and has a peer group within which he does not feel pressured to engage in negative activities in or out of school. He has also enrolled in air cadets at the local centre and is progressing well there too, impressing his leaders with his attitude and presentation.

“C” presents well, both physically and socially, being well-mannered and interested in his learning. He is emotionally stable and comfortable at home and at school and is aware of support systems in place at school and at SPACE if he requires them. “C’s” mum has a very positive view of the provision that was put in place at SPACE, his new school and the way in which “C” is now engaged in his studies.

During the time “C” spent at SPACE, alongside the academic developments he made in core subjects, he also gained an Aim Award at Entry 3 Level in Routine Vehicle Checks and his Royal Yachting Association Competent Crew Certificate.

In addition to this “C” has returned to SPACE with his mum for a reference from the Co-ordinator to allow him to become a youth mentor for Tall Ships after being invited to apply following the voyage where he out-performed his and our expectations, showing incredible maturity, leadership and drive to succeed. He also appears in the new Tall Ships brochure as an inspiration to other young people and of this, he, his mother and the team of staff that have worked with him are very proud.

“C” said “I thought that nobody was there for me, but I have learnt to trust and that people do care. It was amazing and helped me get back into school. Thank you.”

“C’s” mum said (regarding the Tall Ships programme) “It has changed his perception on life; he is more mature and has been able to turn things around; it was a great overall experience.”

Feature 4: Information gathered from the Quality Assurance of alternative provision

16. The County Council has a number of ways in which it monitors the quality of provision made by alternative providers.
17. Nottingham City Secondary Education Partnership (NCSEP) provides a service which includes annual verification and evaluation of all providers offering alternative provision in Nottinghamshire.
18. Nottinghamshire County Council has a contract with NCSEP for commissioning alternative provision for children and young people for whom it has a statutory responsibility. All alternative provision commissioned by the County Council is managed through NCSEP. Increasingly, schools and school partnerships in Nottinghamshire are using the NCSEP system for validating the efficiency and effectiveness of the alternative provision they employ.
19. To become a recommended provider of alternative provision in Nottinghamshire the provider will have to demonstrate that they:
 - meet the criteria set out in the Quality Assurance and safeguarding checklist
 - deliver teaching and learning which is at least satisfactory but ideally good or outstanding
 - will monitor attendance and progress using the collaborative learning manager (CLM)
20. A provider must meet all of the criteria shown above in order to receive validation by NCSEP. Information relating to those providers which are accepted by NCSEP is then made available on a website which may be accessed by schools searching for an appropriate provider. The County Council has established a small commissioning team for alternative provision who are responsible for monitoring the quality of the alternative provision.
21. As GCSE and equivalent validated data does not become available until January, 2015, it is proposed to provide a further report for the Children and Young People’s Committee at its meeting in March 2015. The report will provide more details in relation to the educational outcomes for this group of young people.

In conclusion

22. The behaviour strategy has been successful in achieving the following outcomes:
 - 1) significantly reduced levels of permanent exclusion
 - 2) young people are more likely to remain on the roll of their local school

- 3) increased availability of suitable providers of alternative provision
- 4) increased ownership by schools of the management of provision for challenging young people
- 5) increased dialogue in partnerships between schools about securing suitable solutions
- 6) increased resilience of behaviour partnerships
- 7) increased sign up to partnership agreements and approaches
- 8) improved outcomes and life chances for young people as exemplified in the case studies described earlier in this report.

Areas for further development

23. There are a number of identified areas requiring further development. These include:
- 1) obtain sign up to the MOU from the remaining schools who currently sit outside partnership arrangements
 - 2) continue to collate evidence of positive pupil outcomes and share examples of good practice across all schools.
 - 3) continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of partnership working.

Other Options Considered

24. The report is for noting only.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

25. The report is for noting only.

Statutory and Policy Implications

26. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) That the impact of the new arrangements for children and young people with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) in Nottinghamshire be noted.

John Slater
Service Director, Education Standards and Inclusion

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Chris Harrison
Group Manager, SEND Policy and Provision
T: 0115 9773384
E: chris.c.harrison@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

27. As this report is for noting only, no Constitutional Comments are required.

Financial Comments (KLA 21/11/14)

28. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Specialist provision for children with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties: options and recommendations – report to Children and Young People’s Committee on 10 February 2014

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0529