

Children and Young People's Committee

Date: Monday, 05 November 2012
Time: 10:30
Venue: County Hall
Address: County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP

AGENDA

- | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------|
| 1 | <u>Apologies for Absence</u>
Details | 1-2 |
| 2 | <u>Declarations of Interests by Members and Officers:- (see note below)</u>
(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
(b) Private Interests (pecuniary and non-pecuniary) | 1-2 |
| 3 | <u>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 October 2012</u>
Details | 3 - 6 |
| 4 | <u>Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan</u>
Details | 7 - 24 |
| 5 | <u>Notts Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2011-12</u>
Details | 25 - 28 |
| 6 | <u>Performance Reporting (Q2 2012-13) - Services for Children & Young People</u>
Details | 29 - 36 |
| 7 | <u>Review of Arrangements for Children & Young People with Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficultie</u>
Details | 37 - 66 |
| 8 | <u>Rota Visits to Children's Homes - March & April 2012</u>
Details | 67 - 70 |
| 9 | <u>Heymann Primary School S19 Notice Outcome</u>
Details | 71 - 74 |
| 10 | <u>Brookside Primary School S19 Notice Outcome</u>
Details | 75 - 78 |
| 11 | <u>Funding for Home Extension to enable a looked after child to remain with foster parents</u>
Details | 79 - 84 |

(1) Councillors are advised to contact their Research Officer for details of any Group Meetings which are planned for this meeting.

(2) Members of the public wishing to inspect "Background Papers" referred to in the reports on the agenda or Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act should contact:-

Customer Services Centre 08449 80 80 80

(0300 500 80 80 after 5th November 2012)

(3) Persons making a declaration of interest should have regard to the Code of Conduct and the Council's Procedure Rules.

(4) Members or Officers requiring clarification on whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact Sara Allmond (Tel. 0115 977 3794) or a colleague in the Democratic Services Team prior to the meeting.

(5) Members are reminded that Committee and Sub-Committee papers, with the exception of those which contain Exempt or Confidential Information, may be recycled.

minutes

Meeting CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S COMMITTEE

Date 8 October 2012 (commencing at 10.30 am)

Membership

Persons absent are marked with `A`

COUNCILLORS

Allen Clarke (Vice-Chairman)
Michael J Cox
Bob Cross
Sybil Fielding
John Peck JP
Mike Quigley MBE
Mrs Sue Saddington
Mel Shepherd MBE
S Smedley MBE JP
Brian Wombwell
Liz Yates

A Ex-officio (non-voting)
Mrs Kay Cutts

CO-OPTED MEMBERS (NON-VOTING)

A Ms G Neill
A Mr James Parry
Mr David Richards JP
Mr John Rudd

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Sara Allmond	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Rachel Coombs	Group Manager, Children, Families and Cultural Services
Claire Dixon	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Anthony May	Corporate Director, Children, Families and Cultural Services
Philippa Milbourne	Children, Families and Cultural Services
Beth Richmond	Corporate Communications
Neil Robinson	Group Manager, CFC Investments & Treasury Management
Merlin Tinker	Improvement Programme, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Anna Vincent	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Michelle Welsh	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

MEMBERSHIP

It was reported that Councillor Mike Quigley MBE had been appointed in place of Councillor Philip Owen, Councillor Mel Shepherd MBE had been appointed in place of Councillor Lynn Sykes and Councillor John Peck JP had been appointed in place of Councillor Steve Carroll.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor S Smedley MBE JP declared a private interest in item 4 – Work Programme – 5 November 2012 – Review of arrangements for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties as her daughter worked at the Worksop Learning Centre.

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 10 SEPTEMBER 2012

RESOLVED: 2012/029

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 10 September 2012, having been circulated to all Members, were taken as read and were confirmed and signed by the Vice Chairman.

COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Anthony May introduced the work programme and informed Members of changes to the work programme to enable better management of the work load of the Committee and an additional item to come to the January 2013 meeting.

RESOLVED: 2012/030

That the work programme be noted.

PRESENTATION ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Neil Robinson gave a presentation on the medium term financial strategy. He responded to Members' questions and comments.

RESOLVED: 2012/031

That the presentation be noted

UPDATE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MULTI-AGENCY SAFEGUARDING HUB

Anthony May gave a presentation on the establishment of a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). He responded to Members' questions and comments.

RESOLVED: 2012/032

That the report be noted.

PROGRESS IN THE ADOPTION SERVICE

Anthony May introduced the report and responded to Members' questions and comments.

RESOLVED: 2012/033

That the report be noted.

AUTHORITY GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES AND THE APPOINTMENT OF PARENT, COMMUNITY AND AUTHORITY GOVERNORS TO THE TEMPORARY GOVERNING BODY OF THE NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL IN WORKSOP

RESOLVED: 2012/034

That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 11.45 am.

CHAIRMAN

5 November 2012

Agenda Item: 4

REPORT OF THE GROUP MANAGER, SAFEGUARDING AND INDEPENDENT REVIEW

CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION ACTION PLAN

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of the report is to inform Members of current national and local developments in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

Information and Advice

2. CSE is a high profile political and media issue driven by a number of key players including the voluntary sector, in particular with the work of Barnardos and The Children's Society. There have been a number of high profile media stories detailing CSE cases in different authorities, more recently in Rochdale where a Safeguarding Children Board report highlighted a number of failings by agencies.
3. There is existing national statutory guidance '*Safeguarding Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation*' issued in 2009 as supplementary guidance to '*Working Together to Safeguard Children*'. This guidance sets out how organisations and individuals should work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people from sexual exploitation and forms the basis for current multi-agency practice in this respect. In order to further promote and strengthen agencies' responses to CSE, and to drive progress, in December 2011 the DfE published '*Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation – Action Plan*' followed by a progress report in July 2012. Simultaneously (July 2012) the Government also published a report from the All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) '*Report from the Joint Enquiry into Children who go missing from care*' which considered the risk of looked after children who go missing being vulnerable to sexual exploitation.
4. Locally there has been inter-agency guidance in place to underpin the response to CSE since the publication of the Nottinghamshire document 'Tip of the Iceberg' in 2001. This was revised and reissued as the Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board's inter-agency practice guidance '*Safeguarding Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation*' in November 2011. Within Nottinghamshire, where cases of children have been identified as being at risk of sexual exploitation, they are managed under either Child Protection procedures (for example a child protection conference) or under CSE procedures and a CSE strategy meeting held. During 2011/12, 71 such meetings were held on 32 children. These meetings are multi-agency and are chaired by an independent Child Protection Co-ordinator.

5. During 2012, Nottinghamshire County Council has signed up to the Barnardos '*Cut them free*' campaign and the Children's Society *Missing Children Charter*. These alliances with leading charities demonstrate a public commitment to responding to the issues of CSE and Missing Children and can also be of benefit to NCC in terms of accessing up to date research, thinking and resources.
6. The CSE statutory guidance requires Safeguarding Children Boards and local authorities to:
 - a. Plan and commission services
 - b. Develop policies and procedures
 - c. Ensure appropriate training
 - d. Communicate and raise awareness
 - e. Monitor and evaluate the work that is being done
7. The CSE Action Plan additionally suggests a number of other actions and aims including:
 - a. Mapping and monitoring the levels of CSE locally
 - b. Having a local strategy to ensure a co-ordinated multi-agency response
 - c. Having effective measures to identify, respond to and safeguard vulnerable children
 - d. Establishing local partnerships
8. CSE has been identified as a priority area within the Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB) business plan and in December 2011 the NSCB established a cross-authority (with Nottingham City) multi-agency group chaired by the police to co-ordinate the work of CSE.
9. The work of the CSE cross-authority group has thus far:
 - a. Completed the terms of reference for the group and established membership
 - b. Developed a local strategy and an action plan (see **Appendix**)
 - c. Established a sub-group to develop a training strategy and pathway for professionals
 - d. Commissioned a further sub-group to look at engagement with young people
 - e. Commenced work on exploring a number of operational models to respond to CSE
 - i. Co-located / multi-agency team
 - ii. Virtual team
 - iii. Lead Co-ordinator
10. Within Nottinghamshire, the issues of Missing Children and CSE are seen as inextricably linked both strategically (the same lead officer) and operationally.
11. The particular vulnerability in relation to children who are looked after (LAC) and go missing and may be at risk of CSE is recognised, although not all children who become involved in CSE will go missing and vice versa. As well as the revised local guidance on CSE noted above, a revised inter-agency cross-authority protocol on Missing Children was also published in 2011.
12. Training on Missing Children, including a CSE element, has been delivered during 2011/12 and 2012/13. This has been cross-authority and multi-agency. The NSCB has also included CSE content within other courses in a cross-issue approach, i.e. working

with adolescents and 'what's new in safeguarding' events. A conference on CSE is being held in November 2012, hosted by the NSPCC in collaboration with NSCB and Nottingham City Safeguarding Children Board. This conference is aimed at practitioners across the range of agencies involved in providing an effective response to the needs of young people involved in sexual exploitation.

13. Whilst there has been considerable attention given to developing child sexual exploitation work in Nottinghamshire, there is still a significant amount of work to be undertaken with regards to strengthening all partner agencies' responses to CSE as outlined within the cross-authority group action plan. This includes continued promotion of this area of work with staff, communities and children and young people. The challenge for agencies, where there are competing priorities, is to develop the work at a reasonable pace.

Other Options Considered

14. As this is a report for noting, it is not necessary to consider other options.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

15. Work will continue to develop the response to child sexual exploitation within Nottinghamshire and it may be helpful to provide a progress report after a further six month period.

Statutory and Policy Implications

16. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service 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 report be noted and a further update report provided for the Children and Young People's Committee in May 2013 to reflect progress during 2012/13.

Pam Rosseter
Group Manager, Safeguarding and Independent Review

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Terri Johnson,
Service Manager, Safeguarding Children (Strategic)
T: 0115 977 3921
E: terri.johnson@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

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

Financial Comments (NDR 17/10/12)

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

Background Papers

Safeguarding Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation

<http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/caring/protecting-and-safeguarding/nscb/>

Nottinghamshire and Nottingham City Safeguarding Children Boards' 'Child Sexual Exploitation Multi-Agency Strategy and Action Plan 2012-14'

'Safeguarding Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation' Supplementary guidance to Working Together to Safeguard Children (Department for children, schools and families 2009

<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DCSF-00689-2009>

'Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation – Action Plan' (Department for Education 2011)

<http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DFE-00246-2011>

'Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation – Action Plan (Department for Education 2011) Progress Report

<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DFE-00072-2012>

All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) 'Report from the Joint Enquiry into Children who go missing from care' (2012)

<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/APPG-INQUIRY>

Barnardos 'Cut them free' campaign

http://www.barnardos.org.uk/get_involved/campaign/cutthemfree

Children's Society *Missing Children Charter*

http://makerunawayssafe.org.uk/sites/default/files/resource-files/Runaways-Charter-9-July-A4_0.pdf

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.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0095

Child Sexual Exploitation Multi-Agency Strategy 2012-14

Working Together to Safeguard Children from Sexual
Exploitation in Nottingham City & Nottinghamshire



Statement of Intent

Sexual exploitation of children is child abuse and is completely unacceptable; the only effective way to tackle sexual exploitation of children is via effective multi-agency and partnership working. Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) remains one of the most important challenges for the Safeguarding Children Boards across Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County.

Sexual exploitation of children and young people under 18 involves exploitative relationships, violence, coercion and intimidation, being characterised in the main by the child or young person's limited availability of choice resulting from their social / economic and / or emotional vulnerability.

It is our collective multi-agency responsibility to identify those children and young people at risk of exploitation and our joint responsibility to protect them and safeguard them from further risk of harm. It is also our joint responsibility to, where possible, prevent children becoming victims of this form of abuse.

We will develop an effective local strategy to ensure a co-ordinated multi-agency response to CSE.

We recognise that sexual exploitation can have serious long term impact on every aspect of the child or young person's life, health and education. It also damages the lives of families and carers and can lead to family break ups. It is important that agencies support young people and their families to reduce and begin to repair harm.

We recognise that changes and improvements, whilst needing to be rapid, will realistically be incremental, but they will be based on Statutory Guidance and the DfE Action Plan for tackling CSE as well as utilising research and information from The University of Bedfordshire, Barnardos and the NSPCC. Our approaches will also be consistent with the Missing Children and Adults Cross Government Strategy that requires LSCBs to be pro-active in respect of children who may suffer harm and exploitation as a result of going missing'.

It is our clear intent to improve the lives of children living in Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire. We will do so by ensuring children and young people understand the risks of being exploited, enabling them to cease contact with the perpetrators of this abuse and we will endeavour to bring the perpetrators to justice.

This will lead to better outcomes for children and young people through raised self esteem, engagement in other activities, and through attending school or college to plan for their future.

The strategy for 2012-2013 has an emphasis on:

- **Prevention & Response**
- **Safeguarding & Protection**
- **Bringing Offenders to Justice**
- **Public Confidence**

Our shared key strategic priorities are:

- **Mapping needs in relation to levels of CSE**
- **Putting in place systems for monitoring the prevalence and response to CSE, i.e. through the use of data**
- **Working towards a co-located multi-agency team to deliver a co-ordinated response**
- **Increase understanding & awareness of CSE among professionals and the wider community**
- **Training staff across agencies to identify CSE and respond appropriately**

How we will achieve our priorities?

A multi-agency child sexual exploitation (CSE) cross authority group will meet regularly.

This will enable us to work collaboratively, consistently, and effectively to improve the lives of children and young people at risk of harm from, or subject to, child sexual exploitation.

The group will:

- Identify what needs to be done to safeguard children and young people from CSE
- Drive forward and support the work that needs to be done to tackle child sexual exploitation
- Work towards ensuring consistency of practice



Prevention & Response	
What are we going to do?	How will we do it?
Gain a better understanding of the practice of CSE, develop activities which will dissuade children and young people becoming involved in CSE and identify those at risk of CSE.	Initially, we will use the research available to develop a complete picture of CSE and to identify actions and practices for tackling CSE in a preventative and early intervention way.
All agencies to ensure staff working with, or in contact with, children understand the signs of precursor types of behaviour and develop intervention strategies to prevent escalation. This will include those displaying precursor behaviour in relation to victimisation and offending.	Through training and development ensure all staff has sufficient awareness of potential indicators of CSE. Review victim profiles to gain improved understanding of underlying factors which may be precursor indicators.
Develop local problem profiles.	Identify what local factors are enabling perpetrators or increasing risk to victims and eliminate that risk through an intelligence led multi-agency approach. Identify high risk or hot spot locations and implement multi-agency preventative plans. Develop clear referral and assessment processes for those at risk to match with preventative service delivery such as Early Intervention Services.
Deliver a universal education and marketing package to the children and young people of Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire designed to heighten awareness and reduce risk taking. Raise awareness of CSE within our communities.	Develop a package of training resources for young people. Identify those agencies that need resources and those who are best placed to deliver training according to local problem profiles.

Safeguarding and Protection	
What are we going to do?	How are we going to do it?
Work towards specialist co-located multi-agency teams covering Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Local Authorities, which can support victims as well as deter offending and maximise prosecution activity.	Seek agreement in principle from the LSCBs and partner agencies to establish co-located teams. Agree service levels and joint resourcing commitments between partner agencies, including the voluntary sector. This may be an incremental process.
Identify children at risk at an early stage across all agencies and ensure those children have a full assessment of their needs and referral to relevant services for intervention and support.	Develop clear referral pathways that ensure effective information sharing, assessment and subsequent co-ordinated service delivery. Ensure all staff in contact with young people has training consistent with their role to identify those at risk of exploitation and those suffering exploitation.
Adopt a whole family approach when supporting families to parent, protect and engage. Highlight and educate parents and carers of the benefits of working collaboratively with agencies.	Ensure the commitment of all agencies to work with families to agree plans of support to educate and assist parents. Identify and then reduce the factors which will cause the child or young person to remain in a risky situation.
Set the DfE guidance Safeguarding Children and Young People from Sexual Exploitation as well as the DfE Action Plan as the minimum standard across Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire.	The LSCBs will continue to review current arrangements, protocols and policies of member agencies to assure compliance. The LSCBs will establish CSE as a priority area.
The NSCB and NCSCB will provide ongoing scrutiny and governance of policy, procedure and practice in service delivery.	To monitor compliance through the CSE Cross-Authority Task & Finish Group and address any shortfalls.

Bringing Offenders to Justice	
What are we going to do?	How are we going to do it?
Identify Offenders.	We will ensure that CSE victims receive follow up visits post incident, in order to capture vital intelligence and ensure full disclosure. This aims to close the intelligence gap, support prosecutions and create a clear picture of CSE. Conduct debriefs of convicted offenders to gain an improved intelligence picture of offender behaviour.
Ensure victims' are supported throughout the Criminal Justice process from report to court.	Enlist help and support to victims by the non statutory / voluntary sector to improve their engagement and experience throughout the Criminal Justice System process.
Develop CSE problem profile, incorporating data from improved intelligence collection and data from all agencies.	All front line agencies should develop ways of capturing and recording data relating to known or suspected cases of sexual exploitation. A multi-agency data set will be established for use by the Police and services for sexually exploited children. This will also be the basis of reporting to the LSCBs. Nottinghamshire Police will use the data along with intelligence to develop regular problem profiles of sexual exploitation
Learn from previous, current and future prosecutions to ensure all investigations into CSE are undertaken by professionally trained staff.	Outline best practice in relation to the support available for victims, including after the process has completed. Review all recent cases to identify key aspects of the investigation and Criminal Justice process that can lead to successful or unsuccessful prosecution outcomes. Ensure suitably qualified investigators with specific knowledge of CSE and Child Abuse undertake investigations.
Develop a CSE Victims' Charter	Closer liaison with Criminal Justice partners to ensure the provision of CPS specialists and specialist courts. The adoption of this methodology within the domestic abuse arena has led to improved victim experience and ensures county wide continuity of processes.

Public Confidence	
What are we going to do	How are we going to do it?
Engage with our local communities and raise awareness of CSE and how it affects individuals and wider communities.	LSCBs to develop key messages for engagement strategy. All agencies to utilise their existing partnerships and develop new arrangements of community engagement. Standing Agenda item for LSCBs.
Agree a Multi-Agency Media Strategy	Develop a strategy which will target different sections of the community in the most appropriate manner. This will involve utilising multi-media /social networking technology to raise awareness and increase reporting. Through use of the media the LSCBs will seek to promote the activity defined within this strategy.
Educate all sections of our communities.	Linked with the Media Strategy. Partnerships agencies will engage with our communities in a multi-stranded way to educate and raise awareness to all sections of the community and increase reporting among key groups within the community for example hoteliers, taxi drivers, door staff etc
Develop plans reflecting local problem profiles in line with the LSCB strategy.	Develop engagement plans in line with LSCB key messages to reflect local problem profiles and requirements. Plans to be reviewed by LSCB CSE Cross Authority sub group.
Proactively engage businesses within our communities.	Plan how to engage with businesses to prevent and respond to CSE, which may include disruption techniques.

Child Sexual Exploitation Multi-Agency ACTION PLAN 2012-14

Working Together to Safeguard Children from Sexual Exploitation in Nottingham City & Nottinghamshire



Nottinghamshire
SAFEGUARDING
CHILDREN Board



NOTTINGHAM CITY
Safeguarding
Children BOARD

Overarching strategy and governance

Responsibility

There will be an effective local strategy to ensure there is a co-ordinated multi-agency response to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) based on a robust, thorough risk assessment of the extent and nature of CSE locally. The work on CSE will be monitored by the LSCBs.

Action	Lead	Timescale	Progress to date	Rag Rating
a) Complete a Strategy Document	CSECAG	31 May 2012	Completed	
b) Complete and agree Action Plan	CSECAG	31 May 2012	Completed	
c) Complete Terms of Reference for the cross-authority group	CSECAG	31 May 2012	Completed	

1. Prevention & Response

Promote awareness to improve early identification of child sexual exploitation

There is a critical need for far more awareness amongst all professionals in universal and specialist services of their role in identifying and addressing child sexual exploitation. Children and young people and their parents and carers need to have the right information to help them access support quickly and safely.

Action	Lead	Timescale	Progress to date	Rag Rating
1.1 Establish effective communication channels between LSCB and partner agencies to share information and training				
1.2 Establish a training working group to:	Training Working Group (Jo Williams,			
a) Develop a training programme				

<p>which is suitable for use across the agencies</p> <p>b) Identify which agencies and groups of workers need to have training & who will deliver it</p> <p>c) Specifically identify how to engage with school staff & governors</p> <p>d) Identify how to engage with young people</p> <p>e) Identify mechanisms for rolling out training</p>	<p>CityCare Partnership)</p>			
--	------------------------------	--	--	--

2. Safeguarding and Protection

Establish a clear process by which professionals respond appropriately to concerns about CSE

It is important to understand the scale and nature of the problem and there should be systems in place to monitor the prevalence and response to it. It is vital that once suspicion or actual concerns of CSE have been identified that there are clear and robust systems in place to respond to the highlighted concerns or allegations.

Action	Lead	Timescale	Progress to date	Rag Rating
<p>2.1 Map the levels of CSE and related data within the Police, City & County</p> <p>a) Referral data related to the police & LAs.</p> <p>b) outputs</p> <p>c) cross reference to missing children & other related data</p> <p>2.1 This data will be monitored for prevalence and response via CSECAG, steering group and the</p>	<p>DI Hillier, Notts Police</p>			

LSCBs.				
2.2 Work towards the establishment of a cross-authority co-located multi-agency team with: a) LSCB support b) Standard operating protocols Establish who will be partners	Terri Johnson, Notts County Council			

3. Bringing Offenders to Justice

Improve Police and multi-agency approaches to support bringing offenders to justice.

The overall strategy, approach and response by professionals should support bringing offenders to justice. However, there are actions which the Police will employ to improve Police prosecutions.

Action	Lead	Timescale	Progress to date	Rag Rating
3.1 Await outcome of ACPO review of the DfE Action Plan	DI Hillier, Notts Police			

4 Public Confidence

Engage with local communities to raise awareness of CSE and how it affects individuals and communities.

Communities will be enabled to understand what the scale of the problems is and how it impacts on them individually or as a whole community. Strategies may need to be developed to engage with communities to be part of preventing or responding to the problem.

Action	Lead	Timescale	Progress to date	Rag Rating
4.1 NSPCC Launch Event to be	Liz Tinsley,	10.10.2012		

held in October 2012	NSPCC			
4.2 County & City LA sign up to the Barnardo's 'Cut Them Free' Campaign' and joint media statement with the Police.	Kim Pocock, NCSCB	11.06.2012		

5 November 2012**Agenda Item: 5****REPORT OF THE GROUP MANAGER, SAFEGUARDING AND
INDEPENDENT REVIEW****NOTTINGHAMSHIRE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL
REPORT 2011/12****Purpose of the Report**

1. To inform Members of the content of the Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board's Annual Report 2011/12, which is attached as an **Appendix**.

Information and Advice

2. The current national statutory guidance 'Working Together to Safeguard Children 2010' notes the requirement for Safeguarding Children Boards to produce and publish an annual report on the effectiveness of safeguarding in the local area. This report should provide an assessment of the effectiveness of local arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. It should recognise achievements and the progress that has been made in the local authority area as well as providing a realistic assessment of the challenges that still remain.
3. The Working Together guidance is currently being revised and a draft document has been circulated for consultation. The revised draft document reinforces the expectations of Safeguarding Children Boards to publish an Annual Report and make this available to the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council, the local Police and Crime Commissioner, and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
4. The Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB) Annual Report outlines the context, both national and local, which has driven the work of the Board during the year. It outlines the key priority areas addressed by the Board including the work of the Child Death Overview Panel and the management of the serious case review which was initiated and completed during the year,
5. The Report identifies the organisational structure that supports the work of the Board together with the relevant areas of responsibility. A key area for the Board is the coordination and provision of multi-agency safeguarding training. The nature of the training provision was revised during the year to reach a wider audience of staff from across the range of agencies, both statutory and voluntary, involved in safeguarding and protecting children. Feedback from those attending NSCB training events continues to be very positive. The number of learners registered with the NSCB e-learning module

'Awareness of Child Abuse and Neglect' increased as did the numbers of those completing this course.

6. Work undertaken to strengthen the effectiveness of the response to child sexual exploitation, missing children, anti-bullying and managing allegations against those who work with children is also covered in the Report.
7. During 2011/12 all NSCB agencies again completed self-assessments to measure their compliance against key safeguarding standards. Overall compliance with the standards was high; where there was a need to improve performance individual agencies identified appropriate actions. There will be a progress report on these areas to the NSCB meeting in January 2013.
8. The NSCB has continued to strengthen its arrangements for providing scrutiny of safeguarding arrangements and this has included taking on the responsibility for the ongoing monitoring of key areas previously addressed through the Safeguarding Improvement Programme.
9. The Report shows the NSCB's multi-agency financial arrangements and contains some detailed performance information covering 2011/12.
10. Finally, the Report sets out the Board's priorities for 2012/13 and highlights the main contextual influences which will impact on safeguarding arrangements over the next period of time.

Other Options Considered

11. As this is a report for noting, it is not necessary to consider other options.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

12. The report is for noting only.

Statutory and Policy Implications

13. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service 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 report be noted.

Pam Rosseter
Group Manager, Safeguarding and Independent Review

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Steve Baumber
NSCB Development Manager
T: 0115 977 3935
E: steve.baumber@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

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

Financial Comments (NDR 16/10/12)

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

Background Papers

None.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0097

5 November 2012**Agenda Item: 6****REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND
CULTURAL SERVICES****PERFORMANCE REPORTING (QUARTER 2 2012/13) – SERVICES FOR
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with a summary of the performance of the Council's services for children and young people during the period 1 July – 30 September 2012.

Information and Advice

2. At the meeting on 16 July 2012, the Committee agreed to receive a quarterly report, which reviews performance across the full range of services provided to children and young people. These reports will normally be presented to the meetings in September, November, February and May, and will be in addition to other reports that may be presented to the Committee from time to time providing detailed performance-related information about specific initiatives, projects or services e.g. the Children's Social Care Transformation Programme and/or education outcomes.

Performance Reporting for 2012/13

3. As agreed at the meeting on 16 July 2012, quantitative performance reporting to the Committee will be measured via 38 key performance indicators (KPIs), which cover the full range of services to children and young people. For each KPI, current performance will be compared to the national average and that of the Council's statistical neighbours, where this data is available. The list will include a number of KPIs that reflect priorities within the Council's Strategic Plan, and which will also therefore be reported to the Policy Committee. Equally, relevant KPIs will also be included in periodic performance reports to the Early Years and Young People's Sub Committee.
4. Although it was agreed that performance be reported on a quarterly basis, the Committee acknowledged that not all of the 38 KPIs are equally sensitive to quarterly fluctuation. For example, education performance indicators are largely annually based, such as the pupil attainment at different Key Stages. In accepting that KPIs will not always change from one quarter to the next, it was agreed that the most up-to-date information will be provided for each KPI. A table summarising the different types of KPI, and their respective sensitivity to fluctuation, is provided at **Appendix 1**.

5. The performance data for Quarter 2 2012/13, as described above, is set out in the table at **Appendix 2**. In addition to the comparison against the national average and statistical neighbours, the report also provides a basic trend analysis to indicate whether performance against each of the indicators has improved (+), declined (-), or remained the same (=) over the current reporting period.

Other Options Considered

6. The process for presenting performance information set out in this report is in line with corporate guidance, which has itself been established following an appropriate analysis of alternative options.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

7. The recommendation for quarterly reporting to Committee, and the KPIs that will form the basis of the report, is in line with the established processes of reporting and publishing performance information across all of the services within the Children, Families and Cultural Services Department.

Statutory and Policy Implications

8. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service 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 Committee notes the contents of the report.

Anthony May
Corporate Director for Children, Families and Cultural Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Jon Hawketts
Senior Executive Officer
T: 0115 9773696
E: jon.hawketts @nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

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

Financial Comments (NDR 17/10/12)

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

Background Papers

None.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0103

APPENDIX 1

The table below summarises the different types of KPI that will be reported to the Children and Young People’s Committee, together with any analysis of how/when the data will be refreshed during 2012/13.

2012/13													
Apr-12	May-12	Jun-12	Jul-12	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	Jan-13	Feb-13	Mar-13		
Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 3			Quarter 4				
2011/12 academic year (Sep-11 to Aug-12)				2012/13 academic year (Sep-12 to Aug-13)									
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2012/13 Quarter 1 Report (published Aug 2012)</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2012/13 Quarter 2 Report (published Nov 2012)</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2012/13 Quarter 3 Report (published Feb 2013)</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2012/13 Annual Report (published Jul 2013)</div> </div>													
12/13 Q1 average			12/13 Q2 average			12/13 Q3 average			12/13 Q4 average			12/13 annual average	
Quarterly reporting: average performance e.g. Initial assessments for children's social care carried out within timescales % of re-referrals to children's social care %age of looked after children with 3 or more placements in any one year % young people in years 12-14 not in education or training													
Q1 performance			Q2 performance			Q3 performance			Q4 performance				
Quarterly reporting: snapshot performance on a defined day in quarter e.g. Participation in Education and Work Based Learning in academic years 12-14 % of children's centres achieving good or better in Ofsted inspections													
12/13 Q1 performance			12/13 Q1-Q2 performance			12/13 Q1-Q3 performance			12/13 Q1-Q4 performance			12/13 annual performance (=Q1-Q4)	
Quarterly reporting: cumulative e.g. Numbers of young people engaged in positive activities delivered by the Young People's Service													
11/12 annual performance (=Q1-Q4)			12/13 Q1 performance			12/13 Q1-Q2 performance			12/13 Q1-Q3 performance			12/13 Q1-Q4 performance	
Quarterly reporting: data available one quarter in arrears e.g. First-time entrants to the youth justice system													
11/12 annual performance			11/12 annual performance			11/12 annual performance			11/12 annual performance			12/13 annual performance	
Annual reporting e.g. %age of care leavers in suitable accommodation													
10/11 results (confirmed)			11/12 results (provisional)			11/12 results (provisional)			11/12 results (provisional)			11/12 results (all confirmed)	
Academic year reporting: annual reporting e.g. % pupils achieving level 4 in both English and mathematics at age 11 Achievement of 5+ A*-C GCSE or equivalent including English and mathematics Early years foundation stage attainment % A level entries at A* - E grades / A* - B grades Attainment gap at age 16 between Free School Meal pupils and the rest													
11/12 spring term			11/12 spring term			11/12 summer term			11/12 summer term			12/13 autumn term	
Academic year termly reporting: data available one term in arrears e.g. Number of primary schools in an Ofsted category Number of secondary schools in an Ofsted category													

Note: There are a small number of indicators that do not fit these categories, e.g. child poverty, teenage conceptions, which are published with a delay of 2 years and 15 months respectively and during the middle of the business year, not at the end.

In all cases, the performance information reported to Committee will be based upon the latest available data.

Children and Young People's Committee: Performance at 2012/13 Quarter 2

For Nottinghamshire, the performance data available at the end of 2012/13 Quarter 2 (July-September) is reported.

The most recent available data for national average and statistical neighbours is reported where available, for comparison. Comparisons may be indicative only as the reporting periods are not necessarily aligned.

Where Nottinghamshire performance exceeds national performance, this is highlighted by the emboldened boxes.

Key: (p) = provisional data; (+) = better than previous value; (-) = worse than previous value; (=) = same as previous value; (n/a) = cumulative data, so not comparable to previous value

Priority	Performance Indicator	Nottinghamshire			National Average	Statistical Neighbours	
		Reporting Period	Current Value	Previous Value			
A: Continue to improve our work to keep children and young people safe	AP01 Initial assessments for Children's Social Care carried out within timescales	Q2 2012/13	86.5% (-)	88.3% (Q1 2012/13)	77.2% (10/11)	78.0% (10/11)	
	AP02 Core assessments for Children's Social Care carried out within timescales	Q2 2012/13	82.4% (-)	85.2% (Q1 2012/13)	75.0% (10/11)	75.0% (10/11)	
	AP03 Percentage of child protection cases reviewed within timescale	Q2 2012/13	99.5% (-)	99.6% (Q1 2012/13)	97.1% (10/11)	97.4% (10/11)	
	AP04 Re-referrals to Children's Social Care	Q2 2012/13	26.7% (+)	27.8% (Q1 2012/13)	25.6% (10/11)	22.4% (10/11)	
	AP05 Children who are subject to a child protection plan for 2 years or more	Q2 2012/13	6.6% (-)	5.2% (Q1 2012/13)	6.0% (10/11)	5.7% (10/11)	
	AP06 Children becoming the subject of a child protection plan on more than one occasion	Q2 2012/13	12.5% (+)	15.2% (Q1 2012/13)	13.3% (10/11)	13.7% (10/11)	
	<i>AP07 New adoption indicator – in line with the national indicator set, the adoption service is looking to develop its reporting of the time period (in days) from being looked after to being placed, and the time period (in days) from placement order to matching panel (target within 7 months).</i>						
	AP08 Percentage of Children's Social Care quality audits assessed as adequate or better	Q2 2012/13	84% (+)	83% (Q1 2012/13)	-	-	
	AP09 Looked after children with 3 or more placements in any one year	Q2 2012/13	7.2% (-)	6.1% (Q1 2012/13)	10.7% (10/11)	9.5% (10/11)	
	AP10 Percentage of looked after children cases reviewed within timescale	2011/12	85.0% (-)	88.7% (2010/11)	90.5% (10/11)	90.1% (10/11)	
	AP11 Percentage of care leavers in suitable accommodation	2011/12	82.7% (-) (p)	98.0% (2010/11)	90.0% (10/11)	86.1% (10/11)	
B: Continue to improve how well children and young people achieve in schools and colleges	BP01 Pupils achieving Level 4 in both English & mathematics at age 11	2011/12 (academic)	80.9% (+) (p)	77.4% (2010/11 academic)	74.0% (10/11)	74.8% (10/11)	
	BP02 Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent (inc. English & maths)	2011/12 (academic)	60.3% (p) (+)	57.6% (2010/11 academic)	58.6% (p) (11/12)	57.7% (10/11)	
	BP03a Primary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour	2011/12 (academic)	93.0% (-)	93.3% (2010/11 academic)	93.9% (10/11)	93.6% (10/11)	
	BP03b Secondary schools judged by Ofsted as having good/outstanding standards of behaviour	2011/12 (academic)	66.7% (-)	70.5% (2010/11 academic)	84.4% (10/11)	85.8% (10/11)	
	BP04a Number of primary schools in an Ofsted category - by term	June 2012 (snapshot)	8 (-) (p)	7 (March 2012)	-	-	
	BP04b Number of secondary schools in an Ofsted category - by term	June 2012 (snapshot)	1 (+) (p)	3 (March 2012)	-	-	

Children and Young People's Committee: Performance at 2012/13 Quarter 2

For Nottinghamshire, the performance data available at the end of 2012/13 Quarter 2 (July-September) is reported.

The most recent available data for national average and statistical neighbours is reported where available, for comparison. Comparisons may be indicative only as the reporting periods are not necessarily aligned.

Where Nottinghamshire performance exceeds national performance, this is highlighted by the emboldened boxes.

Key: (p) = provisional data; (+) = better than previous value; (-) = worse than previous value; (=) = same as previous value; (n/a) = cumulative data, so not comparable to previous value

Priority	Performance Indicator	Nottinghamshire			National Average	Statistical Neighbours
		Reporting Period	Current Value	Previous Value		
	BP05 Early years foundation stage attainment	2011/12 (academic)	64.0% (+)	56.0% (2010/11 academic)	64.0% (11/12)	59.8% (10/11)
	BP06 Percentage of young people who have attained a full Level 3 qualification by 19	2010/11 (academic)	47.3% (+)	45.1% (2009/10 academic)	57.6% (10/11)	52.1% (10/11)
	BP07 Participation in education, employment and training in academic years 12-14	Q2 2012/13	86.1% (-) (p)	89.8% (Q1 2012/13)	-	-
	BP08a Percentage of A level entries at A*-E grades	2011/12 (academic)	97.5% (+) (p)	97.2% (2010/11 academic)	98.5% (p) (11/12)	-
	BP08b Percentage of A level entries at A*-B grades	2011/12 (academic)	42.7% (-) (p)	43.1% (2010/11 academic)	52.8% (p) (11/12)	-
C: Reduce the gap in educational achievement for all ages	CP01a Attainment gap at age 11 between pupils taking free school meals and the rest (<i>FSM at time of assessment – previous definition</i>)	2011/12 (academic)	20.5% (+) (p)	25.4% (2010/11 academic)	21.3% (09/10)	23.6% (09/10)
	CP01b Attainment gap at age 11 between pupils taking free school meals and the rest (<i>FSM during past six years – future definition</i>)	2011/12 (academic)	18.1% (p)	-	-	-
	CP02a Attainment gap at age 16 between pupils taking free school meals and the rest (<i>FSM at time of assessment – previous definition</i>)	2011/12 (academic)	31.8% (+) (p)	33.8% (2010/11 academic)	27.6% (09/10)	33.3% (09/10)
	CP02b Attainment gap at age 16 between pupils taking free school meals and the rest (<i>FSM during past six years – future definition</i>)	2011/12 (academic)	30.7% (p)	-	-	-
	CP03 Rate of permanent exclusions from school	2011/12 (academic)	0.11% (-) (p)	0.10% (2010/11 academic)	0.07% (10/11)	0.09% (10/11)
	CP04 Percentage of overall absence in primary, secondary and special schools	2010/11 (academic)	5.67% (+)	5.84% (2009/10 academic)	5.8% (10/11)	5.7% (10/11)
	CP05 Percentage of young people who have not attained a Level 2 qualification in English & maths at age 16 who go on to attain Level 2 or higher in both by the end of the academic year in which they turn 19	New indicator – first publication of local authority level data due summer 2013				
	CP06 Percentage of young people in Years 12-14 not in education, employment or training	Q2 2012/13	2.7% (+) (p)	3.6% (Q1 2012/13)	6.1% (10/11)	5.9% (10/11)

Children and Young People's Committee: Performance at 2012/13 Quarter 2

For Nottinghamshire, the performance data available at the end of 2012/13 Quarter 2 (July-September) is reported.

The most recent available data for national average and statistical neighbours is reported where available, for comparison. Comparisons may be indicative only as the reporting periods are not necessarily aligned.

Where Nottinghamshire performance exceeds national performance, this is highlighted by the emboldened boxes.

Key: (p) = provisional data; (+) = better than previous value; (-) = worse than previous value; (=) = same as previous value; (n/a) = cumulative data, so not comparable to previous value

Priority	Performance Indicator	Nottinghamshire			National Average	Statistical Neighbours
		Reporting Period	Current Value	Previous Value		
D: Improve children and young people's health and well-being	DP01 Dependent children in households whose income is below 60% of the national average	2009/10	17.1% (+)	17.5% (2008/09)	20.6% (09/10)	17.8% (08/09)
	DP02 Numbers exiting substance misuse treatment in a planned manner	Q1 2012/13	87% (+)	85% (Q4 2011/12)	77% (11/12 Q4)	79% (11/12 Q4)
	DP03 Under 18 conception rate (per thousand females aged 15-17)	2009/10	32.9 (+)	34.6 (2008/09)	35.4 (09/10)	36.0 (09/10)
E: Continue to improve our early intervention services so that children, young people and families in the greatest need receive appropriate support	EP01a Children's Centres reaching families in greatest need: focused population registered	Q2 2012/13	74% (+)	72% (Q1 2012/13)	-	-
	EP01b Children's Centres reaching families in greatest need: focused population seen	Q2 2012/13	42% (n/a)	33% (Q1 2012/13)	-	-
	EP02 First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 (per 100,000)	Q1 2012/13	107 (=)	107 (Q4 2011/12)	-	-
	EP03 Numbers of children and young people engaged in positive activities delivered by the Young People's Service	Q2 2012/13	11,271 (n/a)	5,500 (Q1 2012/13)	-	-
	EP04 Percentage of children's centres achieving good or better in Ofsted inspections	Q2 2012/13	80% (=)	80% (Q1 2012/13)	-	-
	EP05a Breastfeeding prevalence at 6-8 weeks, incl. mixed feeding methods (Notts NHS)	Q1 2012/13	38.2% (-)	39.4% (Q4 2011/12)	46.9% (10/11)	36.9% (10/11)
	EP05b Breastfeeding prevalence at 6-8 weeks, incl. mixed feeding methods (Bassetlaw NHS)	Q2 2012/13	34.7% (+)	32.9% (Q1 2012/13)		

5 November 2012

Agenda Item: 7

**REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, EDUCATION STANDARDS AND
INCLUSION**

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

Purpose of the Report

1. To summarise the outcomes of the recent review of arrangements for children and young people with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) in Nottinghamshire. A full report on the review is available as a background paper.
2. To seek approval to implement a new strategy (as described in **Appendix 1**) for this vulnerable group of learners. This strategy will be implemented through a progressive, phased and developmental approach.

Information and Advice

3. The review of arrangements for children and young people with SEBD was conducted between April and September 2012. This report summarises the outcomes of the review and recommends a new strategy for SEBD in Nottinghamshire.
4. The key objectives of the new approach are as follows:
 - i) to improve the education outcomes for learners with SEBD
 - ii) to work in closer partnership with schools in order to maximise the use of resources.
5. Evidence gathered from the examination of approaches adopted by other County Councils shows that more effective solutions are characterised by schools working together in partnership with greater ownership of learners with SEBD. These approaches have clearly demonstrated better outcomes and better use of resources. This is also borne out by the experience of effective partnership work currently taking place in Nottinghamshire as seen in schools' behaviour and attendance partnerships and through early outcomes arising from two pilot projects in Ashfield and Mansfield.

6. During the review 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 Pupil Referral Unit (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*).
7. 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.
8. 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) and lowest in Newark (6). 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.
9. 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 was not an option.
10. Following an extensive consultation process involving stakeholders, a number of common themes were identified as features of successful practice. 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
 - nurturing environments across all phases
 - effective and collaborative SEBD partnerships with increased devolution of resources and strong links with the PRU
 - availability of short term placements at the PRU without the need for permanent exclusions
 - an agreed charging mechanism for the cost of Alternative Provision for schools which opt out of partnership working
 - cost effective, high quality SEBD provision.

Five Steps to Collective Responsibility

11. There are a number of key partners with responsibility for this vulnerable group of learners who 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 5 steps to collective responsibility which are:

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

12. All schools should be aware of what is expected from them. There should be shared knowledge about good practice. Primary schools should develop nurturing environments. Good transition plans should be in place. All schools should identify a lead professional for SEBD and they should be part of a County-wide supportive network.

Step 2: Strengthening the local partnership offer

13. Increasingly resources will be devolved to partnerships of schools that have suitable alternative provision in place. Partnerships of schools will have increased decision making responsibility for determining access to appropriate provision in their district. Partnerships will develop a range of appropriate alternative provisions to be made available in their schools and local colleges.

Step 3: Defining the role of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)

14. 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. Central to this approach is the PRU which is currently known as 'The Learning Centre'. The new approach is described below:

- **Early Years/Key Stages 1/2** – 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 Stages 4/5** – devolve resources to partnerships in order that they may commission or provide appropriate alternative provision.

15. It is proposed that the 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

16. It is also proposed that new PRU management committees will be formed, in line with DfE guidance, to include strong mainstream school partnership representation. The partnerships will have increased responsibility for agreeing who attends the PRU from their partnership area.

Step 4: Improving the quality of specialist provision

17. 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.
18. This education is provided at a total cost of circa £3 million for 106 learners.
19. 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 provision maintained by the County Council.
20. The County Council will develop a continuum of provision which will 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.
21. The County Council will also establish a preferred provider framework for specialist SEBD provision in the independent non-maintained sector.

Step 5: Defining the role of the County Council

22. 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.
23. The County Council 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

24. The recommendations contained within this strategy 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.
25. 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. It is acknowledged that it is difficult to achieve a pure solution. As such, a number of different approaches will be required at different key stages of the national curriculum.
26. The 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.
27. These working groups will produce an implementation plan between November 2012 and January 2013 in readiness for a phased implementation from April 2013 and beyond.
28. This strategy will have been successful when we can say:
 - permanent exclusions are highly exceptional
 - there are no permanent exclusions in Key Stages 1 and 2
 - young people can receive appropriate alternative provision in their own communities

- schools have developed effective partnerships to which the County Council can confidently devolve funding, resources and responsibility
- teachers feel more confident in managing challenging behaviour
- teachers are able to access support and advice from their colleagues and from specialist teams provided by the County Council
- parents and young people feel more engaged with learning.

Other Options Considered

29. The other option would be to retain the status quo but this would be financially unsustainable as has been recognised by the Schools Forum.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

30. Approval is required to implement the proposed strategy in order that young people receive appropriate provision and that this is affordable within the resources available to schools. It will be necessary to develop a corresponding implementation plan to deliver the required outcomes through a progressive, phased and developmental approach.

Statutory and Policy Implications

31. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Implications for Service Users

32. Service users are pupils at risk of exclusion and schools who are managing their challenging behaviour. There are a number of changes which will benefit service users, such as:
- schools will feel more supported by each other and by the County Council in trying to manage SEBD
 - fewer children should be excluded from schools and partnerships of schools
 - young people will be able to attend the PRU without the need for an exclusion, and when they do, it will be for shorter periods i.e. a maximum of 2 terms
 - young people will receive appropriate provision that meets their needs.

Financial Implications

33. In November 2011 a paper was presented to the Schools Forum which identified the concern that expenditure on SEBD was likely to significantly increase beyond the available resources over 2012/13 and 2013/14. Schools Forum requested that the County Council review its arrangements for SEBD and explore ways in which provision could be remodelled to provide a more cost effective solution. The aim of the review has been to focus on the need to establish appropriate provision whilst ensuring a reversal of a trend towards increased expenditure. It should be recognised that failure to turn around

this trend will result in the need for increased contributions from all schools from the Dedicated Schools Grant.

34. In line with the new strategy, it is proposed that increasing levels of funding will be devolved to partnerships of schools in order that partnerships can establish more local cost effective solutions. At the time of the review expenditure across all key stages and districts was as shown in **Appendix 2**. As indicated earlier in this report, the full year effect of expenditure on providing appropriate education for 380 learners is circa £10 million. It is proposed that further discussions should take place with schools in order to determine an appropriate level of devolution of funds. This will be included as a key feature of the implementation plan.

Equalities Implications

35. As part of the process of making decisions and changing policy, public authorities are required by law to think about the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics (as defined by equalities legislation) and those who don't.
 - Foster good relations between people who share protected characteristics and those who don't.
36. Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a means by which a public authority can assess the potential impact that proposed decisions / changes to policy could have on the community and those with protected characteristics. They may also identify potential ways to reduce any impact that a decision / policy change could have. If it is not possible to reduce the impact, the EIA can explain why. Decision makers must understand the potential implications of their decisions on people with protected characteristics.
37. An EIA has been undertaken and is available as a background paper. Decision makers must give due regard to the implications for protected groups when considering this report.
38. White boys and pupils with SEN are over-represented in the group of pupils who are disadvantaged by exclusion. New arrangements will reduce the impact on this vulnerable group

Safeguarding of Children Implications

39. Children who are in receipt of off-site alternative provision are entitled to receive provision of a high quality and which is subject to safeguarding and quality assurance procedures. It is proposed to establish an approved provider framework to support this.

Human Resources Implications

40. In promoting a shift in responsibility from the Local Authority to partnerships of schools, it is anticipated that some staff currently employed by the Pupil Referral Unit may transfer to the partnerships of schools in order to manage alternative provision. These developments will be part of a phased implementation plan which will be drafted following

approval of the new strategy. Any restructuring required as part of that implementation plan will be addressed in line with agreed HR policies and procedures.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Children and Young People's Committee:

- 1) notes the outcomes of the SEBD review as described in this report
- 2) approves the new strategy for SEBD arrangements: '5 steps to collective responsibility'
- 3) approves the development of a phased implementation plan between November 2012 and January 2013 in order to deliver the new arrangements described in this report from April 2013.

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 9773842
E: chris.c.harrison@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (LM 23/10/12)

41. The Children and Young People's Committee has delegated authority within the Constitution to approve the recommendations in the report'

Financial Comments (NDR 24/10/12)

42. The financial implications are set out in paragraphs 33 and 34 of the report.

Background Papers

Review of arrangements for children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) in Nottinghamshire
Equality Impact Assessment
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.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0105

“5 STEPS TO COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY”
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE’S STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING ARRANGEMENTS FOR
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND
BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES (SEBD)

Introduction

The County Council is required to keep under review its arrangements for special educational provision including its arrangements for pupils with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD). The County Council has focussed its recent review on the needs of young people with SEBD.

The review was conducted between April and September, 2012 and has culminated in the development of this strategy which describes new arrangements for this vulnerable group of learners. The strategy has been developed following a comprehensive consultation with stakeholders including schools, parents, children and young people, elected members and other partners.

It describes how the County Council will work effectively in partnership and collaboration with schools and other agencies in order to improve SEBD provision in Nottinghamshire. It sets out the key steps required to deliver the necessary change and ensure that Nottinghamshire is a place where children and young people are safe, healthy and happy and enjoy a good quality of life and everyone can achieve their potential.

Background

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 the review which provided an excellent opportunity to fully debate these issues in Nottinghamshire.

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

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. In Nottinghamshire we spend approximately £10 million per year on making provision for learners with more complex SEBD. The review has considered whether it is possible to spend that money differently in order to achieve better outcomes for these learners.

The key pressures facing schools and the County Council 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.

What does SEBD mean?

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 the following principles should 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.

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.

In Nottinghamshire 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) and lowest in Newark (6). 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
- with a focus on individual learner progress.

What did we learn from the review?

During the review three consultation events were held at which a number of common themes were identified across all districts in Nottinghamshire which will help to shape future provision. The 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.

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. The outcomes have been grouped under five headings and resulted in a strategy entitled “Five steps to collective responsibility”.

Five Steps to Collective Responsibility

There are a number of key partners with responsibility for this vulnerable group of learners who 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 which are:

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

All schools should be aware of what is expected from them. There should be shared knowledge about good practice. Primary schools should develop nurturing environments. Good transition plans should be in place. All schools should identify a lead professional for SEBD and they should be part of a County-wide supportive network.

Step 2: Strengthening the local partnership offer

Increasingly resources will be devolved to partnerships of schools that have suitable alternative provision in place. Partnerships of schools will have increased decision making responsibility for determining access to appropriate provision in their district. Partnerships will develop a range of appropriate alternative provisions to be made available in their schools and local colleges.

Step 3: Defining the role of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)

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. Central to this approach is the PRU which is currently known as The Learning Centre. The new approach is described below:

- **Early Years/Key Stages 1/2** – 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 Stages 4/5** – devolve resources to partnerships in order that they may commission or provide appropriate alternative provision.

The 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 & North Broxtowe)
- **South:** Rushcliffe, Gedling and South Broxtowe.

New PRU management committees will be formed, in line with DfE guidance, to include strong mainstream school partnership representation. The partnerships will have increased responsibility for agreeing who attends the PRU from their partnership area.

Step 4: Improving the quality of specialist provision

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 c. £3 million for 106 learners.

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 provision maintained by the County Council.

The County Council will develop a continuum of provision which will 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 will also establish a preferred provider framework for specialist SEBD provision in the independent non-maintained sector.

Step 5: Defining the role of the County Council

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.

The County Council 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

The recommendations contained within this strategy 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.

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.

The 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.

These working groups will produce an implementation plan between November 2012 and January 2013 in readiness for a phased implementation from April 2013 and beyond.

This strategy will have been successful when we can say:

- Permanent exclusions are highly exceptional
- There are no permanent exclusions in Key Stage 1 and 2
- Young people can receive appropriate alternative provision in their own communities
- Schools have developed effective partnerships to which the County Council can confidently devolve funding, resources and responsibility
- Teachers feel more confident in managing challenging behaviour
- Teachers are able to access support and advice from their colleagues and from specialist teams provided by the County Council
- Parents and young people feel more engaged with learning.

The full report detailing the outcomes of the SEBD review is available on Nottinghamshire County Council's website.

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'¹). 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.

5 November 2012

Agenda Item: **8****REPORT OF THE GROUP MANAGER, REGULATED AND CORPORATE
PARENTING****ROTA VISITS TO CHILDREN'S HOMES: MARCH & APRIL 2012****Purpose of the Report**

1. To inform the Committee of the outcome of six-monthly rota visits to Nottinghamshire County Council's children's homes which took place in March and April 2012.

Information and Advice

2. **Lyndene** children's home was visited on 11 April 2012 by Councillors Fiona Asbury and Ged Clarke. The visit was very positive, with Councillor Asbury having an opportunity to talk to one of the young people living in the home. She reported the home as *"lovely, clean, warm, well decorated and very homely and welcoming"*. There were no recommendations.
3. **Caudwell House** was visited on 27 March 2012 by Councillor Allen Clarke. This was also a very positive visit. Councillor Clarke commented *"Rooms kept homely and clean. Evidence shows good individuality and cleanliness owing to risk of infection"*. He also observed that the windows needed cleaning, and was told about difficulties in procuring a local window cleaner. This is still the case, and the new manager will be trying to address this. Councillor Clarke also listened to the problems that were occurring with one of the lifts, and requested this be attended to. This has now been done.
4. **Minster View** was visited on 27 March 2012, also by Councillor Allen Clarke. He recorded *"Rooms very homely and well colour co-ordinated. Space for independent living and group living. Good use made of space i.e. ball pool"*. He was particularly impressed with the new sensory area and facilities, which has now been completed. The residential kitchen was also awaiting refurbishment, and this has also been completed. Councillor Clarke made one recommendation relating to the Business Management System (BMS) and this has also been addressed.
5. **Oakhurst** was visited on 18 April 2012 by Councillor Asbury. Councillor Asbury commended the staff, young people, managers and maintenance person on the work they do in maintaining a very welcoming and homely environment, and on achieving a positive Ofsted report. There was a strong recommendation about the upstairs bathroom needing a complete new refurbishment. This was passed onto our property services to action. However, this has still not been done, and is urgently being chased up with property services.

6. **West View** was visited on 2 April 2012 by Councillors John Allin and Bob Cross. West View has not received the report, but the manager has said that there were no recommendations.
7. **The Big House** was visited on 5 April 2012 by Councillors Ged Clarke and John Allin. It is again noted that the current building is in poor condition, and the layout of the building limits what can be done to make it more welcoming and homely. However it was noted that the staff "*have done all they can to make it welcoming*". The new play equipment in the grounds was viewed very favourably.
8. Both Councillors Clark and Allin have made some very useful comments on the form used relating to the difficulties inspecting 'visitors' have in independently ascertaining information about young peoples views about their stay at the Big House. The Service Manager is considering how this can be remedied.

Other Options Considered

9. As this is a report for noting, it is not necessary to consider other options.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

10. The report is for noting only.

Statutory and Policy Implications

11. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service 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 report be noted.

Rachel Coombs
Group Manager, Regulated and Corporate Parenting

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Rachel Coombs
Group Manager, Regulated and Corporate Parenting
T: 0115 9774153
E: rachel.coombs@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

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

Financial Comments (NDR 22/10/12)

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

Background Papers

None.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0110

5 November 2012

Agenda Item: 9

REPORT OF THE GROUP MANAGER, SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS SERVICE

**HEYMANN COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEST BRIDGFORD -
POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF PERMANENT PUPIL PLACES AND DELIVERY
OF EARLY YEARS EDUCATION PLACES: OUTCOME OF A PUBLISHED
SECTION 19 NOTICE**

Purpose of the Report

1. This report provides Committee with the outcome of a published Section 19 Notice and seeks approval with effect from 1 September 2013, for the implementation of the following proposals to:-
 - expand Heymann Community Primary School on an adjoining site in newly built premises thereby increasing the school's net capacity by a further 210 permanent pupil places
 - provide 39 full-time equivalent early years education places for children aged between three and four years at Heymann Community Primary School. Consequently this will lower the age range of the school from 5-11 to 3-11 years.

Information and Advice

2. A formal proposal was agreed by Committee at its meeting on 16 July 2012 and in accordance with the provisions of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, the Local Authority (LA) is required to publish a Section 19 Notice. An appropriate Notice was subsequently published on 7 September 2012 which provided details of the proposal referred to in paragraph 1 above.
3. There is a six week representation period following the publication of Notices during which objections and comments can be made. The Notice expired on 19 October 2012 and during its publication period no representations were received.
4. The decision on the above proposal now falls to Committee to determine. It is a statutory requirement, however, that this determination has to be made within two months of the expiry of the Notice's representation period i.e. by 19 December 2012. Failure to meet this requirement would result in the proposal having to be referred to an independent Schools Adjudicator for a decision to be made.

Other Options Considered

5. All options concerning the provision of additional permanent pupil places that were considered are outlined in the report approved by Committee on 14 March 2012.
6. The only other feasible option available to Heymann Primary School for parents/carers who wish their children to receive early years education between three and four years, is to continue to send them to alternative providers and move the children to Heymann Primary School as appropriate for their statutory education.

Reasons for Recommendations

7. The recommendation reflects the location of the projected demand in West Bridgford; the need to provide for families of more than one child; the need to maintain the high level of educational standards in West Bridgford; and the need to deliver permanent places within a defined and tight timeframe (for September 2013).
8. It is Government policy that early years education places can be delivered through LA maintained schools and providers in the private, independent and voluntary sectors. This proposal is perceived as being in the best interests of both Heymann Primary School and the local community.

Statutory and Policy Implications

9. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Implications for Service Users

10. Children and families will have access to, and an increased choice of, school and early years education in their immediate locality.

Financial Implications

11. The estimated gross costs for developing Heymann Primary are £7.22 million. The funding for this development has already been secured from the Basic Need Programme.
12. Any variation to the numbers of children attending the school through this proposed change to the admission arrangements will be reflected in the school's budget through the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

Equalities Implications

13. Children in central West Bridgford will be able to access school and early years places locally. Any new build scheme will meet requirements for disabled access and special needs.
14. As part of the process of making decisions and changing policy, public authorities are required by law to think about the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics (as defined by equalities legislation) and those who do not
 - Foster good relations between people who share protected characteristics and those who do not
15. Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a means by which a public authority can assess the potential impact that proposed decisions/changes to policy could have on the community and those with protected characteristics. They may also identify potential ways to reduce any impact that a decision / policy change could have. If it is not possible to reduce the impact, the EIA can explain why. Decision makers must understand the potential implications of their decisions on people with protected characteristics.
16. An EIA has been undertaken and is available as a background paper. Decision makers must give due regard to the implications for protected groups when considering this report.

Human Rights Implications

17. Parental preference will continue to be facilitated.

Safeguarding of Children Implications

18. The new build scheme will take account of safeguarding needs and requirements.

Human Resources Implications

19. Appropriate levels of teaching staff will be appointed and funded from the increases to the school budget triggered by the increased number of pupils, and the school will use appropriate recruitment and selection procedures when making appointments.

Implications for Sustainability and the Environment

20. Increasing the number of primary school places is demonstrated by sustainable demand. Any new build project will require planning approval and will meet Building Regulations which reflect sustainability and environmental targets. By providing local school places, the need for travelling by car can be reduced.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That:

- 1) Committee notes the outcome of the Section 19 Notice published under the provisions of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 concerning Heymann Community Primary School.
- 2) Committee agrees to the implementation of the proposals with effect from 1 September 2013 to:-

- significantly increase the number of pupil places at Heymann Community Primary School, from 420 places to 630 places across two sites and develop plans to build on the newly proposed site in central West Bridgford to ensure provision is available in 2013/14
- lower the existing age limit of Heymann Community Primary School from 5-11 to 3-11 years, thereby enabling the school to admit children to attend early years education places.

Marion Clay

Group Manager, Support to Schools Service

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Jonathan Smith

Children's Place Planning and Admissions Area Officer - Rushcliffe

T: 0115 9772497

E: jonathan.s.smith@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (LM 15/10/12)

21. The Children and Young People's Committee has delegated authority within the Constitution to approve the recommendations in the report.

Financial Comments (NDR 17/10/12)

22. The financial implications are set out in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report.

Background Papers

- 1) Report to Cabinet on 14 March 2012 'Proposals to Increase the Supply of Primary School Places In West Bridgford' (previously published)
- 2) Report to Children and Young People's Committee on 16 July 2012 'Heymann Community Primary School, West Bridgford - Possible Expansion of Permanent Pupil Places and Delivery of Early Years Education Places: Outcome of Statutory Consultation' (previously published)
- 3) The Complete Proposal referred to in the published Section 19 Notice
- 4) Equality Impact Assessment

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.

Electoral Division and Member Affected

West Bridgford West:
C0099

Councillor Gordon Wheeler

5 November 2012**Agenda Item: 10****REPORT OF THE GROUP MANAGER, SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS SERVICE****BROOKSIDE COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, EAST LEAKE - DELIVERY
OF EARLY YEARS EDUCATION PLACES: OUTCOME OF A PUBLISHED
SECTION 19 NOTICE****Purpose of the Report**

1. This report provides Committee with the outcome of a published Section 19 Notice and seeks approval for the implementation of the proposal to provide early years places at the above-named school by formally lowering the age limit of the school from 5-11 to 3-11 years, with effect from 7 January 2013.

Information and Advice

2. A formal proposal was agreed by Committee at its meeting on 16 July 2012 and in accordance with the provisions of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, the Local Authority (LA) is required to publish a Section 19 Notice. An appropriate Notice was subsequently published on 7 September 2012 which provided details of the proposal referred to in paragraph 1 above.
3. There is a six week representation period following the publication of Notices during which objections and comments can be made. The Notice expired on 19 October 2012 and during its publication period no representations were received.
4. The decision on the above proposal now falls to Committee to determine. It is a statutory requirement, however, that this determination has to be made within two months of the expiry of the Notice's representation period i.e. by 19 December 2012. Failure to meet this requirement would result in the proposal having to be referred to an independent Schools Adjudicator for a decision to be made.

Other Options Considered

5. The only other feasible option available to Brookside Primary School for parents/carers who wish their children to receive early years education between three and four years, is to continue to send them to available alternative providers and move the children to Brookside Primary as appropriate for their statutory education.

Reason for Recommendation

6. It is Government policy that early years education places can be delivered through LA maintained schools and providers in the private, independent and voluntary sectors. It is also Government policy that parents have the opportunity to express choice. This proposal increases the choice of early years places available in the Brookside catchment area.

Statutory and Policy Implications

7. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Implications for Service Users

8. Children and families will have access to, and an increased choice of, early years education in their immediate locality.

Financial Implications

9. Any variation to the numbers of children attending the school through this proposed change to the admission arrangements will be reflected in the school's budget through the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

Equalities Implications

10. Equal opportunities issues for staff will be addressed within an agreed enabling document and which will follow an agreed standard format.
11. As part of the process of making decisions and changing policy, public authorities are required by law to think about the need to:
 - Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics (as defined by equalities legislation) and those who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share protected characteristics and those who do not.
12. Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a means by which a public authority can assess the potential impact that proposed decisions/changes to policy could have on the community and those with protected characteristics. They may also identify potential ways to reduce any impact that a decision / policy change could have. If it is not possible to reduce the impact, the EIA can explain why. Decision makers must understand the potential implications of their decisions on people with protected characteristics.
13. An EIA has been undertaken and is available as a background paper. Decision makers must give due regard to the implications for protected groups when considering this report.

Human Resources Implications

14. If, as a result of this proposal being implemented, additional staffing is required in school to ensure the effective delivery of the early years education proposed, the school will use appropriate recruitment and selection procedures when making appointments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That:

- 1) Committee notes the outcome of the Section 19 Notice published under the provisions of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 concerning Brookside Community Primary School
- 2) Committee agrees to the implementation of the proposal to lower the existing age limit of Brookside Community Primary School from 5-11 to 3-11 years, thereby enabling the school to admit children to attend early years education places in existing accommodation from 7 January 2013.

Marion Clay

Group Manager, Support to Schools Service

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Jonathan Smith

Children's Place Planning and Admissions Area Officer - Rushcliffe

T: 0115 9772497

E: jonathan.s.smith@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (LM 11/10/12)

15. The Children and Young People's Committee has delegated authority to approve the recommendations in the report.

Financial Comments (NDR 11/10/12)

16. The financial implications are set out in paragraph 9 of the report.

Background Papers

- 1) Report to Children and Young People's Committee on 16 July 2012 'Brookside Community Primary School, East Leake - Delivery of Early Years Education Places: Outcome of Consultation' (previously published)
- 2) The Complete Proposal referred to in the published Section 19 Notice
- 3) Equality Impact Assessment

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

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

Soar Valley: Councillor Lynn Sykes

C0098

5 November 2012

Agenda item: 11

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE

PROVISION OF FUNDING FOR HOME EXTENSION TO ENABLE A LOOKED AFTER CHILD TO REMAIN WITH FOSTER PARENTS AS THE SUBJECT OF A SPECIAL GUARDIANSHIP ORDER THROUGHOUT CHILDHOOD

Purpose of the Report

1. To seek approval to fund the cost of an extension to the foster carer's home to allow them to continue to care for one child who has been placed with them since May 2010. The carers are seeking a Special Guardianship Order for this child. They wish to continue to foster for the Local Authority. In order to do this they will need to extend their current property from three bedrooms to four, and the estimated cost is £30,000 - £35,000. The discrepancy is due to possible increase in costs once planning is approved which may identify costs not already anticipated. It is hoped that the cost will be kept to a minimum.
2. The Local Authority has been directed by Nottingham County Court to report back on the funding request – the Court are of the view that the carers should be supported to enable them to care for the child as the subject of a Special Guardianship Order. The Children's Guardian is fully supportive of the plan that the child remains with these carers throughout her childhood.
3. Initial plans have been drawn up and estimates sought. Approval would also be required from the mortgage lender regarding the Local Authority's proposal to place a charge over the property. Once funding is agreed a planning application will be made.

Information and Advice

4. The child is a white British child placed in a family similar to that of her own background. She was accommodated as a subject of Section 20 of the Children Act in 2010 as a result of her parent's continued neglect of her. The child was placed with her brother in her foster placement.
5. In December 2010 Mansfield Magistrates Court approved making a Care Order. The adoption panel was held in August 2011, where the plan for adoption was recommended.
6. The child and her brother remained in placement together until February 2011 when her brother's placement broke down due to his escalating behaviour and significant care needs which the carers did not feel able to meet, he was subsequently placed in an alternative placement. She has remained in the same foster placement since being

placed into care and has expressed a wish to stay with her current foster carers. The child has responded really well to the care she has received and has made excellent progress in terms of her development and social skills. Her needs have been met consistently during her time in foster care.

7. It is recommended she will have ongoing direct contact with her brothers, twice per year. For her mother, direct contact is proposed to take place twice per year. With regard to her father letter box contact is being recommended once per year. The current carers are willing and able to facilitate this and will continue to do so throughout her childhood.

Other Options Considered

8. If the child was to remain the subject of a Care Order, she would then remain a Looked After Child until she reaches the age of 18, and fostering allowances would be payable in respect of her. There would also be ongoing further costs associated with this, including Social Worker intervention and support, additional allowances for clothing and holidays and the cost of Aftercare support services.
9. The Local Authority currently has the option to secure permanency for this child by way of a Special Guardianship Order. In relation to best possible outcomes for her, this gives her the opportunity to be a permanent member of this family with a different legal status to Looked After Children who will also be part of the household. Originally the Local Authority plan was one of adoption; this has changed due to the current carers expressing their wish to pursue a Special Guardianship Order.
10. The White Paper 'Adoption: A New Approach' states that a Special Guardianship Order would:

'give the carer clear responsibility for all aspects of caring for the child and for taking the decisions to do with their upbringing: The child will no longer be looked after by the Local Authority: Provide a firm foundation to build a lifelong permanent relationship between the child and their carers: Be legally secure: Preserve the basic link between the child and their birth family'.
11. A plan for the child to be adopted outside of her birth family had been placed before the court. It is the view of the Judge dealing with this matter that there is an alternative route to permanency for this child through a Special Guardianship Order to her current carers. This will give her permanency; she already has an existing relationship and attachment to the family who are committed to care for the child through her childhood.
12. Adoption would not be an appropriate plan given that here is a good alternative family who can meet her needs. If an adoption plan was pursued, a placement would be required through an outside agency. The cost of an inter agency placement would be £27,000 and there would be ongoing financial costs associated with this through adoption financial support. Given the child's age, a placement could not be guaranteed.
13. The court will not grant a Placement Order which would allow the Local Authority to place the child for adoption given the current carers' application. The Judge and Children's Guardian are fully aware of the funding issue in this case and that it is being presented to

the Committee. They are supportive of the plan that the child remains in her current placement as the subject of a Special Guardianship Order.

14. The Local Authority will be able to reduce financial risk by having a legal agreement with the carers regarding repayment of the grant should the carers cease to look after the child prior to her reaching the age of 18.
15. This proposal represents Best Value in terms of both financial investment and in terms of best possible outcome for the child. The child can also enjoy an ongoing relationship with her birth sibling which is positive in terms of her understanding of her identity.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

16. To ensure that the child receives a safe, stable, secure upbringing with carers with whom she has an existing positive relationship. The current carers are experienced foster carers who wish to continue fostering as their career choice.
17. In order to enable them to keep this child as the subject of a Special Guardianship Order and to remain fostering for this Local Authority they would need an extra bedroom. Their property is three bed roomed - they have their own daughter who has her own bedroom, the child has her own bedroom and the carers share the third bedroom. The proposed extension would provide the fourth bedroom which would be used for foster children.
18. For the Local Authority to recruit and assess new carers the cost would be in excess of £12,000.
19. The proposal is that the child remains in her current carers' care, thus avoiding the cost of an inter-agency adoption placement costing £27,000 to the Local Authority plus additional allowances and support costs. The proposal is also that the carers remain Local Authority foster carers thus avoiding the cost of recruiting new carers at a cost of £12,000.

Statutory and Policy Implications

20. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Implications for Service Users

21. This child has a right to achieve permanence and long term stability and security within her existing network. It offers the greatest likelihood of success for this child.

Financial Implications

22. The current carers would require an estimated £30,000, up to a maximum of £35,000, to enable such an extension to be completed to their property, which would allow the child to have her own bedroom in the family home. This would be approximately equivalent to

5% of the cost of the child remaining a Looked After Child. Payment of this lump sum would come from the Permanence Team budget and Fostering Team budget and would be subject to a legal charge.

23. As the financial assessment is that the carers are likely to receive a Special Guardianship Order allowance, the carers will not be required to make a financial contribution to the rest of the extension.

Human Rights Implications

24. The family has a right to a private and family life (Article 8) with the least intervention from the Local Authority. This plan would be in line with this directive.

Safeguarding of Children Implications

25. The current arrangements ensure the safety and wellbeing of the child until such a time as she reaches adulthood. Assessments have been carried out which support that the carers are able to meet the child's needs and ensure that she is free from risk of significant harm.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That:

- 1) Approval is given for the extension to the foster carers' home to be carried out at an estimated cost of £30,000, up to a maximum cost of £35,000.
- 2) A legal charge order is made, to ensure that the costs of the extension can be reclaimed/reimbursed if the child does not remain in this placement until adulthood.

Steve Edwards
Service Director, Children's Social Care

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Amanda Collinson
Children's Service Manager
T: 01623 433169
E: amanda.collinson@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (LM 23/10/12)

26. The Children and Young People's Committee has delegated authority within the Constitution to approve the recommendations in the report.

Financial Comments (NDR 22/10/12)

27. The financial implications are set out in paragraphs 22 and 23 of the report.

Background Papers

None.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All.

C0106

