

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Kerry Nicholls
kerry.nicholls@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4602

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 9th March 2012

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER BRIEFING

Meeting to be held on Tuesday 20 March 2012

QUESTIONS ON THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER BRIEFING

The Briefing comprises:

- 1 CYP INVEST TO SAVE BIDS - UPDATE** (Pages 3 - 14)
- 2 PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS FROM BROMLEY SECONDARY SCHOOLS** (Pages 15 - 16)

Members and Co-opted Members have been provided with advanced copies of the briefing via email. The briefing is also available on the Council website at the following link:

<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=559&Year=2012>

Printed copies of the briefing are available upon request by contacting Kerry Nicholls on 020 8313 4602 or by e-mail at kerry.nicholls@bromley.gov.uk.

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Briefing for Children and Young People Portfolio Holder 20 March 2012

CYP INVEST TO SAVE BIDS - UPDATE

Contact Officers: Kay Weiss, Assistant Director (Safeguarding and Social Care)
Tel: 020 8313 4062 E-mail: kay.weiss@bromley.gov.uk
Bob Garnett, Interim Assistant Director (Education)
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: bob.garneet@bromley.gov.uk
David Bradshaw, Head of CYP Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Gillian Pearson, Director of Children and Young People Services

1. Summary

- 1.1 The prime purpose of this report is to update the CYP PDS Committee and the CYP Portfolio Holder on the progress of the Invest to Save bids that are being proposed by the Director of CYP for consideration within the Council's corporate framework which will assess viability, benefits and the business case.
- 1.2 The Invest to Save bids are still in draft form and do not yet have the status of fully worked-up business cases. When this work is completed the submissions will be considered initially by the Chief Executive and Director of Finance prior to formal reporting to the Council's Executive. Further work will need to be undertaken to reach this stage.

2. **BACKGROUND TO INVEST TO SAVE BIDS**

- 2.1 Bromley invest to save schemes need to demonstrate net financial savings to the Council in the longer term and contribute towards the achievement of the Council's priorities.
- 2.2 The following corporate requirements and criteria will apply to all successful bids:-
- 1) Must provide net financial savings and these must be clearly identified (i.e. how and from which budget(s)).
 - 2) Net savings must be sufficient to repay advance from the Invest to Save Fund within a period of 5 years (including assumed loss of interest of 2% p.a.).
 - 3) Must demonstrate contribution to achievement of Council priorities (COP, BBB, etc).
 - 4) Must contribute towards additional performance improvement or stabilise problem area.
 - 5) Bids must only be made if no other funding is available.
 - 6) Any additional unplanned funding will have to be contained within departmental budgets and reported as part of an annual progress report to I&E Sub-Committee.

- 7) There must be clear identification of accountable officer, performance outcomes and monitoring arrangements.
- 8) All proposals will require the prior approval of the Resources Portfolio Holder before consideration by the Executive.
- 9) Progress reports on the use of Invest to Save Fund monies will need to be submitted and will be included in an annual report to the I&E Sub-Committee.
- 10) All approved Invest to Save schemes will require a post-completion review report to be submitted to the I&E Sub-Committee in the year of completion.

2.3 CYP have four bids currently in progress, ranging from relatively small scale schemes in children's social care to a large scale project focusing on increasing the borough's SEN capacity for secondary aged pupils with autism.

3. INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

3.1 Development of Autism Specific Provision for Secondary Age Children

The Executive Working Group received an update report at its meeting on 28 February and resolved that the proposal to proceed with the Riverside School expansion by 1FE (8 pupils) from September 2012 be confirmed and fast tracked to ensure capital can be secured. The Working Group agreed also that technical feasibility work should be procured for a 2FE (16 pupils) specific provision on the Glebe school site, including the possible re-modelling of some existing learning areas in order to integrate post 16 work, providing access to specialist curriculum areas and minimising the need for new build. Short break provision is to be included as part of the Glebe expansion and technical feasibility work is to be procured for respite care at a suitable site.

The broad outline of the financial case for this development was presented to the January meeting of the Executive Working Group and a further interim report, containing more financial information is due to be presented at the next meeting on 11 April, prior to consideration by the Executive. The agreed timetable provides that once the business case has been completed and endorsed through the Working Group then a further update will be brought to CYP PDS Committee.

3.2 Increasing London Borough of Bromley Foster Care Placements (Appendix 1)

Current analysis indicates that we need to increase our numbers of in house carers by 40 – 50 families and that we need to address shortages for of London Borough of Bromley placements for adolescents with challenging behaviour and children with a disability. Additionally we need to develop placement support to foster carers to enable them to cope with the difficult behaviours exhibited by our complex and challenging children. The objective of the project is to increase stability for the children and young people and reduce the current dependence and high expenditure incurred by having to place children in high cost independent foster homes and residential placements.

3.3 Expediting Adoption Placements and Plans (Appendix 2)

The number of children requiring adoptive placements has increased in line with the increasing numbers of children coming in to Council care during 2009, 2010 and 2011. Delay in progressing adoption plans is prejudicial to successful outcomes for children and also means children remain in care longer at a cost the Council. The objective of this two year project is to place children in adoptive placements at the earliest opportunity.

3.4 Children's Family Contact Centre in Anerley (Appendix 3)

This project is for the conversion of the James Dixon Children and Family Centre (which was identified for closure as part of the Council savings) to a Children Social Care Family Contact Centre in Anerley. The objective of the project is to achieve better value for money, contain the costs of the current provision of a statutory supervised contact, in addition to guarantying the quality of provision and achieving a small saving.

INVEST TO SAVE PROJECT APPRAISAL – NEW SCHEMES

A. PROJECT SPECIFICATION

1. Project title and description: Increasing LBB Foster Care Placement Project

The project is to recruit, assess and support additional in-house foster carers to meet the increasing demand for foster care placements and to reduce the need to use more expensive IFA carers and residential placements. Current analysis suggests that we need to increase our cohort of in-house carers by an additional 40 - 50 fostering units. The shortages of carers particularly for adolescents with challenging behaviour and disabled children is particularly acute and we plan to focus upon the recruitment of carers (a) for these children and young people. In addition, extra capacity is required (through the commissioning from an external provider) to undertake assessments (a), together with an increase in the staffing establishment (b) to provide the statutory support to approved foster carers once assessed. The final part of the proposal is to appoint a temporary project worker (c) to develop a robust support scheme for foster carers that will prevent placement breakdown, and meet the needs of some of our more challenging young people. The costs described above will be as follows;

(a) - to undertake assessments and other costs associate with the recruitment of Foster Carers £70,000 one off in 2012-13

(b) additional staff to provide statutory support to approved foster carers £81,880 per annum recurring

(c) Temporary project worker £44,000 for 2012-13 and 2013-14 only

2. Financial summary

	£000
Total cost	£404,000
Amount required from Invest to Save Fund	£404,000
Full Year Revenue saving	173,500
Payback period (years)	3

3. Proposed start date

01/04/2012

4. Proposed completion date

31/03/2015

B. POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

5. What are the aims and objectives of the project?

To reduce the number of children who are placed in IFA placements and/or residential accommodation which in turn will reduce the placement budget spend.

6. Which objective(s) of the Council's Plans and Strategies (specifically the "BBB 2020 Vision" Sustainable Community Strategy, Corporate Operating Principles, Portfolio/Service Plans, Asset Management Plan and I E & E Plans) will be met by the project, and how?**7. What are the expected additional outputs and outcomes from the proposed project? (including increase in service users, additional jobs, etc.)**

To increase the number of in-house foster carers. To date, in 2011/12 25 children and young people that were newly admitted to care and were placed in IFA foster placements at a cost of £374k. Given that IFA placements costs approximately 50% more than in-house placements this has meant an additional cost of £173,500 against in-house costs.

8. What, if any, statutory requirement or government initiative(s) will the project contribute towards?

The local authority has a statutory duty (Children Act 1989) to provide accommodation to children and young people in need of accommodation and who cannot remain in the care of their parents.

9. What, if any, partnership working will be involved, and how?

The proposal to establish a project to develop additional support for foster carers to enable them to work with children and young people with challenging behaviour will engage with partners to establish a multi agency 'team around the child' approach, ensuring that children and young people and their carers can have easier access to CAMHS, education support, etc.

10. Who are the interested stakeholders and what consultation has taken place with them?

The stakeholders are the children and young people that require to be looked after by the Council, our in-house foster carers and more widely the residents of Bromley who contribute through their council tax towards the costs to the Council for looked after children. No formal consultation with stakeholders has taken place.

C. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Costs and savings	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 & later years £000	TOTAL £000
Total estimated scheme cost		196.0	208.0	404.0
Less: contribution from mainstream budgets (specify)				
Less: contribution from other partners/bodies (specify)				
Amount requested from Invest to Save Fund	0.0	196.0	208.0	404.0
Ongoing Revenue savings (specify)		86.8	348.0	434.8
Less: loss of interest re "up-front" fund contribution (2% p.a.)		3.9	8.3	12.2
Total Revenue saving	0.0	82.9	339.7	422.5
Period of payback to invest to save fund (normally maximum of 5 years)				3

D. RISK MANAGEMENT

12. Please identify any potential risks associated with the project. (These could include risks associated with income risk, uncertainty over future costs, marketing assumptions etc.)

There are a number of risks associated with the project. Firstly, we may not attract sufficient interest from prospective carers to increase the cohort of in-house carers. Whilst this would mean that we did not spend the money being requested through the invest to save bid (except for a small amount for advertising) the projected savings would not be realised as we would continue to need to place children and young people in IFA and/or residential accommodation.

13. What contingency arrangements would be in place to address these risk factors?

Continued monitoring of response would influence whether a different marketing strategy was required.

14. Can funding be provided from government grant and other external sources (please indicate alternative funding sources available or reasons why such funding is not available)

None. The costs of providing placements for LAC is provided for in the Council's grant.

15. What, if any, would be the consequences of not undertaking the project?

Based on the current demand for placements and the increasing number of looked after children the costs of providing placements to children and young people through IFA or residential accommodation would continue to increase.

E. SUSTAINABILITY

16. Has any consideration been given to social, environmental and financial outcomes arising from the project? Please provide details.

17. Have the whole life costs of the scheme been fully considered (i.e. have all the key stages of the scheme been considered, from design through to potential disposal), and have the social, environmental and economic impacts and costs, both positive and negative, been identified? Please provide details.

The Council already provides a fostering service and has a number of approved carers that are used to provide placements for some of our children. Foster carers are self employed and are only paid for the children they have in placement. The ongoing risk to the Council of 'too many' carers should the number of looked after children reduce in minimal. However, based on current numbers of LAC it is unlikely that the need for in-house placements will reduce in the short to medium term.

F. GENERAL

18. Are there any VAT implications arising from the proposed scheme? (These must be signed off by Maria Wiles and/or Tracey Pearson before the bid can progress).

None

19. What would you assess the overall priority for this project to be? (please tick as appropriate).

	High	Medium	Low
Departmental	X		
Public		X	
Council Members	X		

20. Please indicate the outcome of discussions with:

Chief Officer/DMT
 Portfolio Holder
 Head of Finance

G. PROJECT MANAGER / RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

Name of responsible officer
 Job Title
 Contact details - telephone
 - e-mail

INVEST TO SAVE PROJECT APPRAISAL – NEW SCHEMES

A. PROJECT SPECIFICATION

1. **Project title and description: Expediting Adoption Placements Project**

A project to ensure that children where adoption is the permanent plan are matched and placed without delay to ensure the best outcomes for them and to make savings reducing the number of fostering weeks needed before placement. Increased volumes in Children's Social Care activity since 2009 has increased the numbers of looked after children. Many of these children are under 8 years old and have adoption plans. Some children's plans were subject to delay as a result of shortage in social worker's. There are 42 children with an adoption plan which needs to be progressed quickly or risk long term fostering costs because the children become too old to adopt. The project plan is to employ 1 qualified Senior Practitioner at £44 inc. on costs for a period of 2 years to expedite adoption plans and ensure that children are matched and placed early. Bromley is at the bottom end of the Adoption League table for placing children in adoptive homes within 12 months of the Agency decision to adopt. The project aims to progress the adoption plan and save 8 weeks fostering costs per week per child (£3,200 per child x 42 children = £134k total savings over a 2 year period)

2. **Financial summary**

	£000
Total cost	88,000
Amount required from Invest to Save Fund (1 snr practitioner) at £44k pa x 2 year	88,000
Full Year Revenue saving	104,000
Payback period (years)	2

3. **Proposed start date**

01/04/2012

4. **Proposed completion date**

31/03/2014

B. POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

5. **What are the aims and objectives of the project?**

The number of children requiring adoptive placements continues to rise in line with the increase in the general number of looked after children (42). Delay is not only prejudicial to the successful outcomes for children it also means that children remain in care longer at a cost to the Council. With foster placement costs for a child under the age of 5 being in the region of £400 per week plus the associated back office costs savings could be achieved if children were to be placed at the earliest opportunity. Objective is to save 8 weeks fostering costs per child. (£3,200 per child x 42 children = £134k over 2 years).

6. **Which objective(s) of the Council's Plans and Strategies (specifically the "BBB 2020 Vision" Sustainable Community Strategy, Corporate Operating Principles, Portfolio/Service Plans, Asset Management Plan and I E & E Plans) will be met by the project, and how?**

7. **What are the expected additional outputs and outcomes from the proposed project? (including increase in service users, additional jobs, etc.)**

It is expected that through the employment of an additional social worker in the adoption service that additional capacity will be created that expedites children being placed in adoptive placements, through targeted support to front line practitioners and enhanced family finding activity.

8. What, if any, statutory requirement or government initiative(s) will the project contribute towards?

The preparation of children to be adopted (including the necessary Care Proceedings) is a statutory responsibility under the Children Act 1989. The Council is also an approved Adoption agency responsible for the assessment of adoptive parents, matching and placement of children in adoptive placements.

9. What, if any, partnership working will be involved, and how?

Partnership working is with internal staff and external adoption agencies.

10. Who are the interested stakeholders and what consultation has taken place with them?

Stakeholders are internal staff who require expert advice and assistance in the adoption process.

C. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Costs and savings	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 & later years £000	TOTAL £000
Total estimated scheme cost (2 years)		44.0	44.0	88.0
Less: contribution from mainstream budgets (specify)				
Less: contribution from other partners/bodies (specify)				
Amount requested from Invest to Save Fund	0	44.0	44.0	88.0
Ongoing Revenue savings (specify)		30.0	104.0	134.0
Less: loss of interest re "up-front" fund contribution (2% p.a.)		0.9	0.9	1.8
Total Revenue saving	0	29.1	103.1	132.2
Period of payback to invest to save fund (normally maximum of 5 years)				2

D. RISK MANAGEMENT

12. Please identify any potential risks associated with the project. (These could include risks associated with income risk, uncertainty over future costs, marketing assumptions etc.)

The risks to this project is the delayed placement of children in adoptive placements. The savings will be cumulative and are difficult to exactly quantify as there are a number of factors that can delay placement. However, with weekly fostering costs in the region of £400 per week per child the speedy placement of children should make significant savings.

13. What contingency arrangements would be in place to address these risk factors?

The appointment of the specialist worker goes some way to reduce risk. In addition, this post would be kept under review and the post holder employed on a series of short term contracts to ensure that should the project not prove to be beneficial that it can be ended.

14. Can funding be provided from government grant and other external sources (please indicate alternative funding sources available or reasons why such funding is not available)

None

15. What, if any, would be the consequences of not undertaking the project?

Current lack of capacity means that there is some delay currently in placing children in adoptive placements. If we do not provide some additional response this would continue and a cost to the Council for the long term continued care of the child.

E. SUSTAINABILITY

16. Has any consideration been given to social, environmental and financial outcomes arising from the project? Please provide details.

None applicable

17. Have the whole life costs of the scheme been fully considered (i.e. have all the key stages of the scheme been considered, from design through to potential disposal), and have the social, environmental and economic impacts and costs, both positive and negative, been identified? Please provide details.

Please see question 13

F. GENERAL

18. Are there any VAT implications arising from the proposed scheme? (These must be signed off by Maria Wiles and/or Tracey Pearson before the bid can progress).

None

19. What would you assess the overall priority for this project to be? (please tick as appropriate).

	High	Medium	Low
Departmental	X		
Public	X		
Council Members	X		

20. Please indicate the outcome of discussions with:

Chief Officer/DMT
Portfolio Holder
Head of Finance

G. PROJECT MANAGER / RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

Name of responsible officer
Job Title
Contact details - telephone
- e-mail

INVEST TO SAVE PROJECT APPRAISAL – NEW SCHEMES

A. PROJECT SPECIFICATION

1. **Project title and description: Proposal to Develop a Children's Social Care Family Contact Centre in Anerley**

The project is for the conversion of the James Dixon Children & Family Centre (identified for closure by CYP PDS on 06 September 2011) to a Children Social Care Family contact centre for the maintenance of supervised contact between Children in Care and their birth families on the west side of the borough. Currently the supervised contacts required on the west side of the borough are held in venues hired from the private sector which when combined with the costs of staff transporting children back and forth to the Orpington centre when private venues are not available has resulted in projected total costs in 2011/12 of £109,000. The estimated running costs for the proposed contact centre on an annual basis is £92,000 (1.5fte Family Support Workers (BR6) £37,579 (inc on costs), Utilities, contract cleaning, etc £29,000, Office Supplies and services £5,000, 1 Administrative Assistant (BR5) £20,636 (inc on costs)). The current request is for the capital costs and set up costs incurred (£40k) as a result of a change of use. The £40k is for a kitchen area, security fencing and other small building works plus furnishing. See attached report, appendix 1 for a detailed breakdown. The conversion of the centre to a resource that will continue to provide services for children 0-16 years will potentially mean that the original Children's Centre capital costs of £367,000 will not need to be repaid by the Authority to central government. In addition the centre will be made available for the conduct of parenting assessments, Family Group Conferences and other direct family support activity where venue hire costs are currently an additional funding burden for Children's Social Care. The planned closure of a number of Children's Centres from April 2012, where currently supervised contact is held at no charge to the department, could result in additional venue hire expenditure of a further £33k, totalling a possible cost in 2012/13 of £140,000.

2. **Financial summary**

	£000
Total cost	92
Amount required from Invest to Save Fund	40
Full Year Revenue saving	15
Payback period (years)	2.8

3. **Proposed start date**

01/04/2012

4. **Proposed completion date**

31/12/2014

B. POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

5. **What are the aims and objectives of the project?**

To reduce costs on the provision of a statutory service on the west side of the borough that will guarantee the quality of provision, ensure continuity of local community services and save money.

6. **Which objective(s) of the Council's Plans and Strategies (specifically the "BBB 2020 Vision" Sustainable Community Strategy, Corporate Operating Principles, Portfolio/Service Plans, Asset Management Plan and I E & E Plans) will be met by the project, and how?**

7. **What are the expected additional outputs and outcomes from the proposed project? (including increase in service users, additional jobs, etc.)**

The project will ensure the maintenance of a local and community based provision and capacity on the West side of the borough which would otherwise be lost by the closure of the Children's Centre on this site. The site will also offer the only dedicated contact venue which will have disabled access for children and families to have contact. The project will also ensure the continuity of the breakfast club which provides a valuable service to local working parents. If this centre is not available it would be likely that the breakfast club would cease to exist as there are no other venues with the capacity to accommodate the service.

8. What, if any, statutory requirement or government initiative(s) will the project contribute towards?

The local authority has a statutory duty to maintain contact between children taken into care and their birth families where this remains in the best interest of the child (Children Act 1989). The supervision and monitoring of contact forms part of the assessment and reporting for care proceedings when the Authority is taking steps to ensure and safeguard the well being of the child(ren).

9. What, if any, partnership working will be involved, and how?

The Centre is on the site of the James Dixon school and the support and co-operation of the school and its governing body will be important to the successful operation of the centre. The centre will be accommodating services on behalf of the Early Years service (Breakfast club) and other early intervention services (eg parenting groups).

10. Who are the interested stakeholders and what consultation has taken place with them?

The stakeholders are the families and children living in the west of the borough who have supervised contact and are currently required to travel across the borough to Orpington. The James Dixon school and the Early Years services who have been involved along with the manager of the Bromley Children's project in the development of the project plan. No formal consultation process has been undertaken with service users but all other parties have held discussions with service managers and have had the opportunity to input their views and concerns. CSC participated in the formal consultation process for the future of the borough's Children Centres and registered formal expressions of interest at that time.

C. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Costs and savings	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 & later years £000	TOTAL £000
Total estimated scheme cost		40.0	0.0	40.0
Less: contribution from mainstream budgets (specify)		0.0	0.0	0.0
Less: contribution from other partners/bodies (specify)				
Amount requested from Invest to Save Fund	0.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
Ongoing Revenue savings (specify)		15.0	27.2	42.2
Less: loss of interest re "up-front" fund contribution (2% p.a.)		0.8	1.4	2.2
Total Revenue saving	0.0	14.2	25.8	40.0
Period of payback to invest to save fund (normally maximum of 5 years)				2.8

D. RISK MANAGEMENT

12. Please identify any potential risks associated with the project. (These could include risks associated with income risk, uncertainty over future costs, marketing assumptions etc.)

There are risks associated with the siting of this centre on the grounds of the James Dixon school inherent in the Academies agenda and the possibility of the site being "separated" from the Local Authority property portfolio. As some "site" costs (inc CCTV and utilities) are shared across the school and the centre on a pro rata basis, a separation of the school from the Authority control may cause problems in negotiation and possible additional costs in establishing separate cost monitoring systems (eg separate metering of utilities).

13. What contingency arrangements would be in place to address these risk factors?

A formal contract and costing agreement will be drawn up between Children's Social Care and the School identifying the "benefit and the burden" for each party.

14. Can funding be provided from government grant and other external sources (please indicate alternative funding sources available or reasons why such funding is not available)

None

15. What, if any, would be the consequences of not undertaking the project?

Children's Social Care will need to continue to hire private venues and be vulnerable to their pricing mechanisms and decisions, especially as the availability of provision is currently restricted to one provider on the west of the borough. The Breakfast Club may cease to exist for working parents and the service will need to continue to transport children across the borough when contacts can be accommodated in Orpington but placing children at risk from long and tiring journeys and the inherent risks of road travel.

E. SUSTAINABILITY

16. Has any consideration been given to social, environmental and financial outcomes arising from the project? Please provide details.

The project will be ensuring the continuity of current community services as the Children & Family Centre is identified for closure by the Bromley Children's Project. The James Dixon School has indicated that it does not have the funds to take over the building and its running for its own purposes. No other credible proposal has been received for the centre so it would become a derelict building. The Local Authority may be required to refund to central government the original £367k capital funding received for the development of the provision for 0-5year olds.

17. Have the whole life costs of the scheme been fully considered (i.e. have all the key stages of the scheme been considered, from design through to potential disposal), and have the social, environmental and economic impacts and costs, both positive and negative, been identified? Please provide details.

F. GENERAL

18. Are there any VAT implications arising from the proposed scheme? (These must be signed off by Maria Wiles and/or Tracey Pearson before the bid can progress).

19. What would you assess the overall priority for this project to be? (please tick as appropriate).

	High	Medium	Low
Departmental	X		
Public	X		
Council Members	X		

20. Please indicate the outcome of discussions with:

- Chief Officer/DMT
- Portfolio Holder
- Head of Finance

G. PROJECT MANAGER / RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

Name of responsible officer
 Job Title
 Contact details - telephone
 - e-mail

Kay Weiss
Assistant Director, Safeguarding & Care

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

**Briefing for Children and Young People Portfolio Holder
20 March 2012**

**PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS FROM
BROMLEY SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Mike Barnes, Head of Access and Admissions
Tel: 020 8313 4865 E-mail: mike.barnes@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Gillian Pearson, Director of Children and Young People Services

1. Summary

1.1 Permanent exclusions from Bromley secondary schools had reduced from 86 in 2007/08 to 53 in 2008/09, 39 in 2009/10 and 44 in 2010/11. This reduction followed the decision by the CYP Portfolio Holder in June 2008 to establish respite provision. Head Teachers had told the Local Authority that they felt they had to exclude pupils because there was no alternative available to them.

1.2 In the first half of the current academic year there have been 37 permanent exclusions from Bromley Secondary Schools, this compares with 16 in the same period of the previous academic year.

PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS: AUTUMN TERM 2010 TO SPRING HALF-TERM 2011 AND AUTUMN TERM 2011 TO SPRING HALF-TERM 2012

School	AUTUMN		SPRING		TOTALS	
	10 11	11 12	10 11	11 12	10 11	11 12
Beaverwood						
Bishop Justus		1				1
Bullers Wood		2				2
Harris, Bromley				1		1
Charles Darwin		1		1		2
Coopers	4	4	1	1	5	5
Darrick Wood						
Hayes						
Harris, Beckenham	2	7	2		4	7
Kemnal Technology		3	1	1	1	4
Langley Park Boys		2				2
Langley Park Girls		2				2
Newstead Wood						
St Olaves						
The Priory	3	5		2	3	7
Ravens Wood		2				2
Ravensbourne	1		2	2	3	2
					16	37

1.3 The reasons for the 37 permanent exclusions so far this academic year are:

Defiant Behaviour	–	23
Physical Assault against a Pupil	–	5
Physical Assault against an Adult	–	3
Verbal Aggressive/Threatening Behaviour towards as Adult	–	2
Offensive Weapon (in possession of)	–	3
Drugs/Alcohol (in possession of)	–	1

1.4 The Local Authority has a statutory duty to ensure that all permanently excluded pupils resident in the Borough receive full-time education from the sixth day following exclusion. This also applies to resident pupils excluded from out-borough schools. In almost all cases this duty is discharged by excluded pupils attending Kingswood, the Borough's secondary pupil referral unit.

1.5 As of 1 March 2012, there are 85 excluded pupils on roll at Kingswood. This compares to 54 at the same time in 2011.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 It is only the head teacher who can decide whether to exclude a pupil, for a fixed term or permanently, in line with the school's behaviour policy and taking into account all the circumstances, the evidence available and the need to balance the interests of the pupil against those of the whole school community.

2.2 Parents have the right to make representations to the governing body (or discipline committee) about an exclusion, and the governing body must review the exclusion decision in certain circumstances, which include all permanent exclusions. Where a governing body upholds a permanent exclusion parents currently have the right to appeal the decision to an independent appeals panel.

2.3 Schools are under a duty to provide suitable full-time education for an excluded pupil from the sixth school day of any fixed period exclusion of more than five consecutive school days. Local authorities are under a duty to provide suitable full-time education from the sixth school day of a permanent exclusion.

2.4 Parents must take responsibility for their child, if excluded, and ensure that they are not in a public place without good reason during school hours within the first five school days of any exclusion. If they do not, they may be issued with a penalty notice of £50 (rising to £100).

2.5 Parents must also ensure that their child attends the suitable full-time education provided by the school governing body or the local authority from the sixth day of exclusion.

2.6 Parents are expected to attend a reintegration interview following any fixed-period exclusion of more than five days from secondary school. Failure to attend may make it more likely that the court will impose a parenting order if the school or local authority apply for one.

2.7 Specific guidance on exclusion is provided by the Department for Education's guidance "Improving behaviour and attendance: guidance on exclusion from schools and Pupil Referral Units, 2008."