



**Doncaster  
Council**

[www.doncaster.gov.uk](http://www.doncaster.gov.uk)

## **Doncaster Behaviour Review Consultation March 2018**

### **Context and purpose of consultation:**

Doncaster council have conducted a review of the behaviour provision across the borough. The findings of this review have been shared across the school system and a new model of delivery has been developed. In order to serve the delivery of the new model we have developed a set of options which will shape how services are delivered in the future. Consultation will help to shape a 3 year plan for managing the continuum of support for schools and young people.

### **Process:**

The consultation took place between January 29<sup>th</sup> and February 26<sup>th</sup>. The consultation involved meetings with key stakeholders in this area, including:

- Head teachers from special, primary and secondary schools.
- Meetings with affected groups including the high Needs sub-group, school behaviour leaders, learning centre staff, young people and academy trusts.

### **Key questions :**

Stakeholders were asked to respond to the following:

1. Agreement with the new 'delivery model' which describes the intended graduated provision across the borough and the use of resources in order to support this over the next three years.
2. To consider three methods of managing the continuum:
  - a) Delegating all resources back to schools so that schools are responsible for provision.
  - b) The Local authority acts as the strategic commissioner for all AP provision through a procurement process.
  - c) A 'mixed economy' model at primary and secondary phases.

### **Responses to consultation:**

1. *Agreement with the new 'delivery model' which describes the intended graduated provision across the borough and the use of resources in order to support this over the next three years.*

There was clear support for the new 'Intended continuum' and the need for clearer definition regarding the purpose behind each setting. Head teachers welcomed the delivery model but felt that more work needed to be done now in order to be specific about what the models will look like and to ensure that the new model is informed by clear data around current need and future provisions.

2. *To consider three methods of managing the continuum:*

- d) *Delegating all resources back to schools so that schools are responsible for provision.*
- e) *The Local authority acts as the strategic commissioner for all AP provision through a procurement process.*
- f) *A 'mixed economy' model at primary and secondary phases.*

There was clear support for a 'mixed economy' model in both phases. Further points were noted as part of this discussion:

#### **Outreach support:**

Most head teachers felt that it is desirable to build capacity through a cohesive outreach offer. Current outreach support has strengths but is inconsistent and fragmented. Primary heads felt that centralising outreach resources would allow work to be carried out with greater consistency and speed. Secondary heads favoured a greater focus on consistency and building the knowledge and skill set of outreach teams. Primary Learning Centre staff felt that there needs to be cohesive and comprehensive outreach offer with further clarity around role, professional development and governance. They felt that there is a need to broaden their skills and knowledge in supporting schools to develop effective therapeutic intervention, developing links with both mainstream and PRU environments. There was also a perceived need for more support around developing appropriate curriculum models within mainstream schools.

Secondary heads favoured a greater focus on consistency and building the knowledge and skill set of outreach teams. Some head teachers felt that there needed to be greater knowledge about how to use the curriculum flexibly in order to meet the needs of more vulnerable young people

#### **Transition:**

All three Head teacher groups wanted to emphasise the critical importance of transition and the need to focus resources wherever possible on primary age pupils in order to support earlier intervention. There also needs to be greater continuity and a common approach to assessing need and decision making. Heads in all three groups wanted to work together in order to identify how transition can be improved. Secondary heads felt that there was insufficient information given at transition points and this affected their ability to offer appropriate support for students with behavioural needs.

### Decision making:

There needs to be clear, evidence based decision making throughout all processes in order for the correct provision to be matched to pupil need. Pupils should not be placed in any environment without clear, evidence based assessment and an appropriate plan for meeting need. Stakeholders should be fully engaged in all of the processes around student mobility in order to ensure appropriateness and equity.

### SEMH Provision:

All were in agreement that there was an urgent need for specialist SEMH provision and acknowledged that the intended C&I provision would ease some pressure on the system. Currently there are too many children with SEMH needs who are educated in provision that is not suitable to their needs. Out of authority placements are expensive and it would be more efficient and appropriate to offer increased provision within the borough. Primary representatives and some trusts felt that there was increasing pressure with greater numbers of younger children experiencing trauma and attachment issues in the early years of primary school and that appropriate in-reach should be developed. There were some suggestions that we should look to existing provisions with strong expertise in this area in order to set up satellite provision.

### The role of Learning Centres and the PRU:

There is currently confusion regarding the roles of PRU and Learning Centres. There needs to be greater differentiation of roles, whilst maintaining greater 'join-up' of resources and consistency of approach. There needs to be a clear 'flow' of provision and a system that is sensitive to changes in need. Some heads were keen to acknowledge the role played by Learning centres currently and don't want to lose the benefits provided by them in future models.

### Improving the multi-agency response:

All three Head teacher groups cited difficulties in utilising support from Early Help and CAMHS in order to support early intervention. Can more be done in the pre-school years in order to identify families for further support? How can we ensure that there are appropriate resources in place to support parenting support? Primary Heads felt also that Educational Psychology support would benefit from being targeted more effectively. This would be an area where Head Teachers would value more dialogue regarding future strategies in order to build a Doncaster vision for earlier intervention.

### Accountability:

Some secondary heads are concerned about accountability when students are in AP. Schools would like greater accountability around provision and outcomes. Some would prefer a model where students are taken off-roll for the period of AP with the potential to reintegrate at a later date. There should be strong quality assurance and governance for all providers.

### **Other feedback:**

We would prefer Outreach divided into 4 specialist teams (locality based) supporting schools in locality with multi agency teams offering specialist in-reach and outreach – thresholds of support looked at so students can access it in a timely manner. Robust quality assurance in place with LA termly feedback being sought on the quality of each of the services school access – CAMHS, early help, hub, outreach work etc so deficiencies in service delivery can be addressed early. (Empowering minds Academy Trust).

XP trust do not support any of the models offered, but favour a ‘needs-based perspective’:

- ‘A system based upon meeting individual needs not numbers...where provision is flexible and not one size fits all, based on well-informed evidence of need’
- ‘The needs of individual students who are struggling to access mainstream are assessed through professional and collaborative dialogue between school, LA and other stakeholders as necessary’
- ‘Clear accountability and understanding of the legal responsibilities for schools and the LA.’
- ‘A cultural acceptance that mainstream is not suitable for some young people and that effective Alternative Provision is successful and suitable for specific students and will meet their needs where appropriate’