



CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

9 November 2015

SECOND DESPATCH

Please find enclosed the following items:

- Item 4** Review of Work Programme:
- Draft Witness Evidence Plan
 - Scrutiny Initiation Document

1 - 6

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 0207 527 3308
Email : democracy@islington.gov.uk



This page is intentionally left blank

Children’s Service Scrutiny – Draft Witness Evidence Plan For Discussion

Scrutiny topic: Alternative Provision

Our role as a scrutiny committee:

- To assess whether the range and quality of provision provides sufficient opportunities for attainment and clear pathways for progression;
- To consider whether accountability – for example by schools and the Council - for those in alternative provision is good enough;
- To review how to keep children in school and the use of Alternative Provision or exclusion as the last resort;
- To consider ways in which identification and early intervention support to pupils and their families, which improves attainment, resilience, empathy, self-awareness, attendance and other related outcomes, could be improved – early identification in education and early support;
- To make recommendations for innovation opportunities.

Focus

Provision quality and range	<p>SID Objective 2. To identify how we can ensure that provision is of the highest quality.</p> <p>SID Objective 5. To evaluate the quality, standards and value for money of alternative provision providers, and the range of provision.</p>
Pupil outcomes and accountability	<p>SID Objective 3. To make recommendations to further improve the outcomes, attendance, and accountability for those in alternative provision.</p> <p>SID Objective 4. To identify how schools and academies are ensuring the best possible outcomes for the most vulnerable children, including their emotional well-being, and make recommendations about how best practice can be in place in all schools and Academies.</p>
Prevention and early intervention	<p>SID Objective 1. To identify how we can reduce the numbers of children on alternative provision</p> <p>SID Objective 6. To identify how early intervention and ‘Think Family’ approaches can be mainstreamed once the pump priming funding is no longer available.</p>

Key questions

- How can pupils be ‘turned around’ before they become disengaged with their education? How can pupils and their parents/carers get the right help to support their needs?
- How do schools and academies retain full responsibility for learners they exclude or place in alternative provision – including the quality of their education and the outcomes they achieve?
- Is there a sufficient range of good or outstanding alternative provision which enables pupils to achieve good educational attainment on par with their peers regardless of circumstances or settings?
- What are the innovation opportunities that could secure better outcomes for this group of young people?

Work programme for alternative provision scrutiny

1. Additional documentation

- Outcomes in individual schools with contextual data such as attendance and exclusions
- Performance report for current AP providers and value for money

2. Witness suggestions:

Who	Organisation/remit	Area of focus
Context		
Gabby Grodentz	Islington Council - Head of Alternative Provision	How alternative provision is set up in Islington
Pupil outcomes and accountability		
Jamie Brown-Hill	Schools - Central Foundation School	Policies and practices of schools; strategies for full ownership of pupils in AP; identifying and enabling pupils to overcome specific personal, social and academic needs; improving engagement with education; enabling good academic attainment; reintegration into mainstream education; partnership working.
Jo Dibb	Schools - Elizabeth Garrett Anderson	
Audrey Swann Acting Head, Alternative and Complementary Education and Residential Service (ACERS), Lancashire County Council	‘Good practice’ local authority – Lancashire (TBC) Lancashire County Council was one of the local authorities involved in the School Exclusion Trial which encouraged schools to maintain responsibility for the progress of pupils on their roll.	To provide a comparison with the way another borough commissions and delivers alternative provision, the way they work with partners, tackling the issue of schools retaining the responsibility for excluded students including quality of education and outcomes achieved.
Provision quality and range		
Seamus Oates	AP service: TBAP (Tri-Borough Alternative Provision) Multi Academy Trust – Executive Headteacher/CEO	Outline of the provision provided to Islington (and other boroughs where relevant); how closely does provision match young people’s needs; identifying and enabling pupils to overcome specific personal, social and academic needs; improving motivation, self-confidence, attendance and engagement with education; enable good academic attainment with appropriate accreditation and qualifications; and progression following the placement e.g. further education, employment, training or reintegration into mainstream education
Anna Cain	AP provider: The Boxing Academy	
TBC	Other 6 th form colleges – i.e. Westminster Kingsway, BSix	
Prevention and early intervention		
Nigel Smith	New River College	Early identification and intervention opportunities; primary to secondary transition.
Anthony Doudle	Islington Council – Head of School Improvement (Primary)	
Gabby Grodentz Kim Lawson	Islington Council – targeted and specialist early intervention support to pupils and their families: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New wraparound service for alternative provision • IFIT 	How schools, young people and parents are supported; what works; early success indicators
Julie Chambers	Schools – Highbury Fields Girls’ School	Early intervention and low AP Schools with low levels of pupils in alternative provision or with exclusions – their early intervention approach

3. Proposed work plan

9 November 2015: Witnesses – Provision quality and range	
Who	Organisation/remit
Gabby Grodentz	Islington Council – Head of Alternative Provision
Anna Cain	The Boxing Academy
Rebecca Westgate	BSix
Amanda Whelan	Westminster Kingsway

11 January 2016: Witnesses – Pupil outcomes and accountability	
Who	Organisation/remit
Jamie Brown-hill	Central Foundation School
Jo Dibb	Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School

2 February 2016: Witnesses – Prevention and early intervention *Extra evidence meeting*	
Who	Organisation/remit
Nigel Smith	New River College
Anthony Doudle	Islington Council – Head of School Improvement (Primary)
Gabby Grodentz and Kim Lawson	Islington Council – targeted and specialist early intervention support to pupils and families
Julie Chambers	Highbury Fields Girls' School

3 March 2016: Witnesses – Pupil outcomes and accountability	
Who	Organisation/remit
Audrey Swann	Lancashire County Council (TBC) - Best practice in preventing exclusions and comparisons to another local authority.

4. Visits

Visits (to take place between February and March)			
Who	Organisation/remit	Area of focus	When
Young people – past and present including their parents/carers	At a neutral location	To find out about young people's experiences of alternative provision, whether the provision and support was what they needed. How could alternative provision be more effective?	February/March 2016

5. Report

- **12 April 2016:** Draft recommendations
- **9 May 2016:** Final Report

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY INITIATION DOCUMENT (SID)

Review: Alternative Provision

Scrutiny Review Committee: Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

Director leading the review: Mark Taylor

Lead Officers: Gabby Grodentz and Jeff Cole

Overall aims of the review:

1. To identify how we can reduce the numbers of children on alternative provision.
2. To identify how we can ensure that provision is of the highest quality.
3. To make recommendations to further improve the outcomes, attendance, and accountability for those in alternative provision.
4. To identify how schools and academies are ensuring the best possible outcomes for the most vulnerable children, including their emotional well-being, and make recommendations about how best practice can be in place in all schools and Academies.
5. To evaluate the quality, standards and value for money of alternative provision providers, and the range of provision.
6. To identify how early intervention and 'Think Family' approaches can be mainstreamed once the pump priming funding is no longer available.

How is the review to be carried out:

Scope of the Review

The review will focus on:

- 1. The national and local context**
 - The role and responsibilities of Schools and Academies, and the Local Authority
- 2. The reasons why children are in alternative provision**
 - The profile of AP students including attainment, attendance and other outcomes
 - Trends in family histories
 - The child's journey into and through the AP system
- 3. The local AP arrangements**
 - The role of schools
 - The local method for delivering alternative provision
 - Current AP providers
 - Current performance
 - Quality of providers
 - Funding and value for money

4. Opportunities to make local arrangements more effective

- The use of early intervention (i.e. the new wraparound service, IFIT, approaches used by schools, the demand for therapeutic interventions)
- Strategies to ensure schools take full ownership of children on AP
- Outcomes in individual schools with contextual data such as exclusions

Types of evidence:

1. Documentary evidence including

- Contextual report/presentation
- Anonymised audit of young people in alternative provision
- Case studies
- Government guidance and officer briefing notes
- Service plans, performance indicators and update on impact

2. Witness evidence including

- Officer presentations (e.g. IFIT, project lead for new wraparound service)
- A range of secondary schools and Academies, and New River College
- Effective providers of alternative provision
- Other 'good practice' local authorities e.g. Lincoln, Camden's White British Underachievement Project
- Young people in alternative provision and their parents

3. Visits

- A local provider of alternative provision, such as New River College.

Additional Information:

Programme	
Key output:	To be submitted to Committee on:
1. Scrutiny Initiation Document	15 September 2015
2. Draft Recommendations	12 April 2016
3. Final Report	9 May 2016