

EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE: BROMLEY BEHAVIOUR SERVICES WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 5.00pm on 23rd July 2013

Present

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP (Chairman)
Councillor Peter Fortune
Councillor Sarah Phillips
Darren Jenkins – Co-opted Member representing Parent Governors
Graham Ingram – Head Teacher, Burwood School
Paul Murphy – Head Teacher, Ravensbourne School

Also present

Councillor Robert Evans – Portfolio Holder for Care Services
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
Suzanne White – Administrator, Perducta
Kerry Nicholls – Democratic Services Officer

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP was appointed Chairman of the Working Group for the 2013/14 municipal year.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Paula Farrow – Head Teacher, Farnborough Primary School, Patrick Foley – Head Teacher, Southborough Primary School and Neil Miller – Head of School, The Priory School

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd May 2013 were confirmed.

5. OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF BEHAVIOUR SERVICES: WORKSHOP

The Project Manager, SEN and Disability Service led a workshop to evaluate a range of options for the future delivery of Behaviour Services in Bromley agreed at the meeting of Bromley Behaviour Services Working Group on 2nd May 2013.

Each option was considered against seven key principles reflecting the needs and responsibilities of pupils, schools and the Local Authority. Following discussion by the Working Group, the key principles within each option were given a ranking score comprising 1 point (principle not met by option), 5 points (principle part/maybe met) and 10 points (principle met).

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

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 Group noted that this model would be driven by mainstream schools working collaboratively. The Local Authority would still be required to fulfil its statutory functions, however its only role within this model would be as a commissioning authority. This model could support a reduced level of exclusions through schools taking a collaborative approach to early intervention and exploring alternatives to permanent exclusion. It was important to ensure that a return to mainstream schooling was the key aim of any alternative provision and members of the Working Group were advised that the progress of a pupil in a Pupil Referral Unit was judged against the pupil's mainstream provision, ensuring that schools retained a stake in a pupil's progress when they were placed in a Pupil Referral Unit. It was noted that a collaborative of schools would be better placed to access funds for an alternative provision than the Local Authority.

Option E: Existing EBD school expanded to create all-through EBD provision and manage secondary Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and behaviour service

In considering this model, members of the Working Group highlighted that it was likely that any provision for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD) was likely to convert to academy status in time. It was also noted that an EBD school was unlikely to have the wide ranging expertise needed to also manage a secondary PRU and behaviour service. Within this model there would be no incentive for a reduction in the levels of permanent exclusion. An existing Local Authority maintained provision was unlikely to be granted capital funding before any move to academy status.

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

In discussion, Members of the Working Group generally agreed that this model would face similar issues to Option E.

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

In considering this model, members of the Working Group noted that schools would be required to purchase pupil places from the academy school. If this proved high cost, it might encourage schools to support pupils back into mainstream schooling more quickly; however it might also discourage schools from seeking early intervention for pupils. It could be difficult to identify an academy sponsor to host both an EBD and Pupil Referral Unit provision as these had distinct business models. Academy chain schools also often preferred to work with schools in their own group rather than sell places in any provision to other schools, which could act as a barrier to identifying a sponsor. Within this model there would be no incentive for a reduction in the levels of permanent exclusion. It was noted that an academy chain would be better

placed to access funds for an alternative provision than the Local Authority.

Option H: Outsource to third or private sector

In discussion, Members of the Working Group noted that any provision outsourced to the third or private sector would be in competition with the Harris Aspire provision which could help reduce costs of places in any alternative provision; however it was likely any third or private sector provider would seek an exclusivity agreement from schools before committing to develop provision in the Borough. Within this model there would be no incentive for a reduction in the levels of permanent exclusion. An outsourced provision was also unlikely to secure capital funding.

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 considered whether an AEP free school/studio school (academy) would deliver education provision at the right academic level for pupils who would otherwise be accessing a Pupil Referral Unit provision. The Local Authority would still be required to fulfil its statutory functions, however its only role within this model would be as an admissions authority. It was noted that an academy school would be better placed to access funds for an alternative provision than the Local Authority.

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

Members of the Working Group noted that a full delegation of funding could result in smaller schools receiving an insufficient share of funds to support early intervention or Pupil Referral Unit provision for their pupils. The Local Authority would still be required to fulfil its statutory obligations but would have no control over how a school chose to support a pupil's needs. Schools would also not necessarily have expertise in behaviour services when making decisions about their pupil's needs. This model would also make it difficult to track a child's progress as they moved to alternative provision. There was no provision model within this option so no capital funding could be secured.

Following the evaluation process, the options were ranked in order of highest score (the completed Evaluation Matrix is attached as **Appendix 1**).

1 st	Option J: New AEP free school/studio school (Academy) to provide services to permanently or fixed term exclusions (41 pts)
2 nd (Joint)	Option G: Seek an academy chain sponsor to host secondary PRU and behaviour service. EBD primary school? (33 pts) Option H: Outsource to third or private sector (33 pts)
3 rd	Option B: Mainstream schools join a single trust/mutual run by schools for schools with the Local Authority commissioning statutory functions from it (32 pts)
4 th (Joint)	Option E: Existing EBD school expanded to create all-through EBD provision and manage secondary PRU and behaviour

	<p>service (20 pts)</p> <p>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 (20 pts)</p> <p>Option K: Full delegation of funding to all schools, LA kept medical (20 pts)</p>
--	---

In considering the outcome of the evaluation process, Members noted that the new AEP free school/studio school (academy) had received the highest score. No provider for this potential new provision had yet been identified, and it was also underlined that currently there was no recognised demand or cohort for a new AEP free school/studio school (academy).

Paul Murphy – Head Teacher, Ravensbourne School confirmed that Head Teachers had expressed a preference for a model which supported collaboration between schools. It was expected that the majority of secondary schools in the Borough would participate in any collaborative provision, excluding the Harris Academy Schools who would access the Harris Aspire provision for their own students.

In considering the need for a Primary PRU, it was noted that the current Primary PRU had been utilised as an EBD provision and it was important to ensure the right early intervention processes were in place at a Primary level to support pupils back into mainstream education and reduce the number of pupils developing more complex needs as they progressed to Secondary education. The Project Manager, SEN and Disability Service advised members of the Working Group that some Primary School Head Teachers had expressed a preference for an outreach service to run in their schools as a way of providing early intervention services to their pupils.

The Chairman underlined the need for more information to be provided around the number of Primary age pupils who would benefit from an assessment and intervention process, and also to explore the intervention experience of Year 7 and 8 pupils currently accessing PRU services during their Primary age schooling (**Action: ECHS**)

Following the consideration of the Working Group it was **AGREED** to develop a more detailed business case for Options B, G, H and J. Detailed consultation materials would be developed for schools around these options and would be considered at the next meeting of the Bromley Behaviour Services Working Group prior to the consultation being launched.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A range of additional information had been provided to members of the Working Group in advance of the meeting around best practice for behaviour management across Bromley schools and breakdown of staffing and pupil attendance at Kingswood and Grovelands.

The Portfolio Holder for Education was pleased to announce that a uniform

would be introduced at the Grovelands PRU provision from September 2013.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting of the Bromley Behaviour Services Working Group would be held at 5.00pm on Wednesday 2nd October 2013.

The meeting ended at 6.49pm