

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission 14th January 2019 Item 4 – Exclusion Outcomes – evidence gathering session 2. | Item No 4 |
|---|---------------------|

Outline

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission is undertaking a review of the outcomes of children excluded from school. The aims and objectives of the review are at **Appendix A** below. This is the second evidence session at which the Commission will receive the following submissions.

(i) **Feedback from site visits and focus groups (Scrutiny Commission)**

- New Regents College;
- The Garden School;
- Hackney Quest;
- Focus group with young people who have been excluded.

(ii) **Hackney Learning Trust**

Paul Kelly, Head of Wellbeing and Education Safeguarding
Marian Lavelle, Fair Access Panel
Rachel Thompson & Jack Newling, Re-Engagement Unit

Supporting documentation:

HLT Report 1 - Outcomes for CYP excluded from school
HLT Report 2 - Permanently Excluded Children 2016/17
HLT Report 3 - Fixed Term and Permanently Excluded Children 2014-17
HLT Report 4 - Early Help and Universal Service Provision
HLT Report 5 - New Regents College
HLT Report 6 – Risk of Exclusion and SEND
HLT Report 7 - Exclusion Reduction Action Plan
FAP Report 1 - Fair Access Protocol Report
FAP Report 2 – Hackney Headteachers’ Protocol for allocation of FA pupils
Appendix A - In – year Admission Application form
Appendix B – Categories of evidence
FAP Report 3 – In year Fair Access Data 2017/18 – Years 7-11
FAP Report 4 – In year Fair Access Data 2017/18 – Years 0-6
REU Report 1 - Re-Engagement Unit Evaluation Report 2017/18

(iii) Children and Families Service: Young Hackney, Youth Justice and Troubled Families

Sarah Wright, Director of Children and Families Service
Lisa Aldridge, Head of Service, Safeguarding and Learning
Pauline Adams, Principal Head of Service, Early Help and Prevention

Supporting Documentation:

Children Families Service Report 1

(iv) London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Jan Parnell, Assistant Director of Education

(v) Islington Law Centre

Suzanne Frazer

Action

Upon receiving evidence from the contributors outlined above, the Commission may wish to pursue further lines of enquiry to support the aims and objectives of the review (Appendix A).

The members may wish to reflect on:

- (i) Further evidence which may be needed to meet the aims of the review;
- (ii) Emerging conclusions or recommendations from the evidence thus far.

Appendix A.

Overarching aim:

'To identify and assess what happens when a child is at risk of permanent exclusion or has been excluded, scrutinise the outcomes of excluded pupils and to identify those policies and practices which best help to ensure excluded children and those at risk of permanent exclusions have the same opportunities as their peers in mainstream education.'

Component objectives:

A. To assess what provision or support is available to children and their parents, in Hackney schools, at risk of permanent exclusion and those at the point of exclusion.

B. To identify what alternative provision is available pre 16 and post 16 to children who have been excluded from Hackney schools and identify and assess:

(i) if there are any gaps in provision.

(ii) the quality of support received.

(iii) how the impact of being excluded, on their mental health and wellbeing, is monitored to ensure that every child has the same educational opportunities as pupils in mainstream schools.

C. To identify if the different pathways, for children at risk of permanent exclusions or who are excluded, provide the same opportunities as their peers in mainstream school.

D. To acquire a better understanding of how schools, alternative provision settings and the local authority measure and track the attainment and outcomes of children who are at risk of permanent exclusions or excluded to identify:

(i) Where the outcomes for excluded pupils are the poorest and if the outcomes vary across the pupil characteristics?

(ii) Any correlation between exclusions or periods out of school (e.g. reduced timetable or twilight hours) and youth crime, criminal exploitation and wider safeguarding issues.

(iii) The most effective practices, including the support offered, used to successfully reintegrate excluded pupils back into mainstream school and/or into an alternative provision to complete their education.

(iv) How the outcomes are being used to inform the commissioning of alternative provision for excluded children.

E. To assess:

(i) If alternative provision are sufficiently equipped to manage the rising rates of exclusions.

(ii) If the provisions can meet the individual needs of pupils, particularly the disproportionate number of children with Special Educational Needs or Disabilities (SEND) within the excluded cohort.

F. To assess if the partnership between mainstream schools and alternative provision can be expanded to include special schools in order to ensure:

(i) Best practice and expertise between special schools and across all schools settings is shared.

(ii) All provisions are adequately used, and as much as possible.

(iii) That practices in schools with lower rates of exclusions are informing behaviour management strategies, support to pupils, SEND provision as well as mental health and wellbeing support, in those schools with higher levels of exclusions to help reduce the number of exclusions across Hackney.