

EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE: BROMLEY BEHAVIOUR SERVICES WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 5.30pm on 2nd May 2013

Present

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP (Chairman)
Darren Jenkins – Co-opted Member representing Parent Governors
Paula Farrow – Head Teacher, Farnborough Primary School
Patrick Foley – Head Teacher, Southborough Primary School
Paul Murphy – Head Teacher, Ravensbourne School

Also present

Councillor Graham Arthur – Portfolio Holder for Resources
Councillor Robert Evans – Portfolio Holder for Care Services
Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe – Executive Support Assistant to Portfolio Holder for Education
Councillor Stephen Wells – Portfolio Holder for Education
Dr Tessa Moore – Assistant Director (Education)
David Bradshaw – Head of Education and Care Services Finance
John Burrell – Interim Head of the Behaviour Service
Jo Twine – Project Manager, SEN and Disability Service
Kerry Nicholls – Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alexa Michael and Neil Miller, Head of School, The Priory School.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chairman noted that a number of the issues arising from the minutes would be considered during the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th February 2013 were confirmed.

3. PROPOSED MODEL OF BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT FOR PRIMARY AGED PUPILS FOR CONSIDERATION

Members of the Working Group noted the report of the Head Teacher Working Party that outlined a proposed model for future delivery of Behaviour Support services in the Borough.

4. CHALLENGES FOR BEHAVIOUR SERVICE AND OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The Project Manager, SEN and Disability Service gave a presentation outlining challenges for the Behaviour Service and options for future delivery of behaviour services.

The Portfolio Holder noted the importance of ensuring that any model for future delivery of behaviour services be developed primarily for the benefit of the pupils, with children and young people supported to return to mainstream schooling where appropriate. It was also key to ensure that the Local Authority continued to be able to meet its statutory duties with regard to pupils who had been excluded on a permanent or fixed term basis, and was able to place children and young people in a locally-based provision that met their individual needs.

Following consideration, Members of the Working Group agreed the methodology which aimed to

- 1) Produce outline business case – May to July 2013 (to be reported to the next meeting of the Working Group on Tuesday 23rd July 2013)
- 2) Produce full business case – July to October 2013
- 3) Implement – October 2013 to March 2014

The Members of the Working then considered a range of options for future delivery of behaviour services across the Borough.

Option A: Keep medical and home tuition within the Local Authority which could transfer into a successful model in future

Members of the Working Group generally agreed that medical and home tuition, which was provided to around 40 pupils per year, should be retained by the Local Authority at this time. A more cost-effective delivery model, such as provision through a social enterprise, could be developed over time as appropriate.

Option B: Mainstream schools join a single trust/mutual run by schools for schools with the Local Authority commissioning statutory functions from it

Members of the Working noted that it would be key for all schools, excluding Harris Academy schools, to join any trust/mutual run by schools for schools for it to work effectively.

Harris Beckenham aimed to open Harris Aspire Academy, an Alternative Provision Free School, in central Bromley from 2013/14. This school would primarily offer places to pupils who had been excluded on a fixed term or permanent basis from Harris Academies in Lewisham, Croydon and Bromley, as well as offer a limited number of places for other schools to buy into for extended respite.

The Chairman highlighted the importance of ensuring that any behaviour services provision was delivered on a short term basis, with the aim of supporting pupils back to mainstream schooling where appropriate. It was also important to track the progress of pupils attending pupil referral units.

Option C: Create a virtual school comprising the range of provisions and an IT software package for personalised learning plans and tracking

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed that this model was unlikely to operate successfully at this time.

Option D: Appoint one host mainstream secondary school to host secondary behaviour service and secondary pupil referral unit (PRU) and turn primary PRU into a primary provision for pupils with emotional and behaviour difficulties (EBD)

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed that this model was unlikely to operate successfully at this time.

The Chairman underlined the need for schools to share good practice around behaviour management to ensure the best outcomes for pupils and, where appropriate, reduce incidence of fixed rate and permanent exclusions, and asked that more information on these strategies be provided to Members of the Working Group **(Action: ECHS)**.

Option E: Existing EBD school expanded to create all-through EBD provision and manage secondary PRU and behaviour service

Members of the Working Group noted that this model would need strong leadership to operate successfully with either the existing EBD school, PRU or Behaviour Service as the leader of the provision. Both Kingswood and Grovelands were run on an interim basis at present, but there was potential to recruit an Executive Head Teacher to provide the leadership needed to drive forward this model. The Chairman requested that more information be provided around the attendance rates of pupils at Kingswood and Grovelands **(Action: ECHS)**. The Chairman also requested a breakdown of staffing at Kingswood and Grovelands including length of service, qualifications and levels of supply staff **(Action: ECHS)**.

In considering the Local Authority's current EBD provision, Burwood School as the leader of such a model, the Executive Support Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Education was concerned that Burwood's experience was primarily around male pupils aged 10-16 years with a statement of special needs. The wide ranging expertise of Burwood School would not necessarily meet the needs of female pupils or pupils in mainstream exclusion.

It was noted that this model would allow the Local Authority full access to the places available in its role as the admissions authority.

Option F: Existing special school or special school trust to host secondary behaviour service and secondary PRU and turn primary PRU into a primary EBD school

Members of the Working Group emphasised the importance of retaining a primary PRU provision which was able to provide the assessment needed to review support strategies for each pupil and plan for their return to mainstream schooling. Demand for pupil referral unit places was likely to increase at primary level as there was greater emphasis on early intervention, developing bespoke care plans for children to resolve issues at an earlier stage.

The Portfolio Holder for Education queried if an existing primary school might consider hosting a primary PRU. In discussion, Members of the Working Group felt that schools were unlikely to volunteer to host such a unit as the high

turnover of pupils and impact on school standards would be difficult to manage as part of a mainstream school.

The Chairman noted that a respite model which provided a number of short term goals for pupils to support them back into mainstream schooling had been successfully used in secondary schools, and could potentially work at a primary level.

Option G: Seek an academy chain sponsor to host secondary PRU and behaviour service. EBD primary school?

In considering the model, the Chairman expressed concern over attendance levels in alternative provision and highlighted the benefits of 'wraparound' provision offered by some schools and providers of alternative provision. The Assistant Director: Education agreed that it was vital to safeguard young people by ensuring that attendance and non-attendance systems were robust.

The Interim Head of the Behaviour Service noted that attendance could also be negatively affected where Key Stage 3 and 4 pupils were schooled on the same site. This environment did not incentivise younger pupils to return to mainstream schooling and could lead to them emulating the behaviour of older pupils.

Option H: Outsource to third or private sector

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed not to discount this model at this time.

Option I: PRU becomes an academy and sponsors EBD school and other provision

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed not to discount this model at this time.

Option J: New AEP free school/studio school (Academy) to provide services to permanently or fixed term exclusions

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed not to discount this model at this time.

Option K: Full delegation of funding to all schools, LA kept medical

Members of the Working Group noted that secondary schools in the Borough had successfully used a 'fresh start' model where schools agreed to accept pupils returning to mainstream schooling. This process was managed by the Fair Access Protocol Panel (FAPP) and was closely monitored to ensure the pupil received the support they needed to successfully reintegrate. This model would be more difficult to utilise at a primary level as pupils were less able to travel to alternate schools.

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed not to discount this model at this time.

Option L: PRUs become academies but no other structural change

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed that this model was unlikely to operate successfully at this time.

Following the consideration of the Working Group it was **AGREED** to develop a more detailed business case for Options A, B, E, F, G, H, I, J and K.

The Chairman thanked the Project Manager, SEN and Disability Service for her excellent report.

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting of the Bromley Behaviour Services Working Group would be held at 5.30pm on Tuesday 23rd July 2013.

The meeting ended at 6.58pm