



Department  
for Education

# **The Timpson Review of School Exclusion: Government Response**

**May 2019**



# **The Timpson Review of school exclusion Government response**

Presented to Parliament  
by the Secretary of State for Education  
by Command of Her Majesty

May 2019



© Crown copyright 2019

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at Department for Education,  
Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT

CCS0519157494                      05/19  
ISBN 978-1-5286-1271-5

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum

Printed in the UK by the APS Group on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office



**Rt Hon Damian Hinds MP**

Secretary of State

Sanctuary Buildings Great Smith Street Westminster London SW1P 3BT

tel: 0370 000 2288 [www.education.gov.uk/help/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/help/contactus)

**Edward Timpson CBE**

7 May 2019

Dear Edward,

Thank you for your thorough, wide-ranging and important review of school exclusion. Your review adds considerably to understanding of current practice, and I welcome the recommendations you have made.

The Prime Minister commissioned your review to investigate the variation in exclusion rates between pupils from different ethnic groups, as part of the Government's wider commitment to reduce ethnic disparities. The analysis for your review has found that, when comparing children from ethnic minorities in aggregate with White British children, there is no substantial difference in exclusions rates. You also found that, when other factors about their background are taken into account, children from some groups (such as Black Caribbean children) are more likely to be excluded than White British children, while children from some other groups (such as Indian children) are less likely to be excluded.

Every child deserves to receive an excellent education. This is as true for those in alternative provision as it is for those in mainstream schools; for those thriving at school and for those who may be at risk of exclusion. I know this is an ambition shared by teachers and school leaders across the country.

I want teachers to be free to teach and pupils to be free to learn in a safe and ordered environment. This means supporting head teachers to use their powers to issue fixed-period exclusions ('suspensions') in response to poor behaviour and to permanently exclude ('expel') as a last resort. Like you, I agree that there is no optimum rate of exclusion.

It also means supporting schools to give pupils at risk of exclusion the best chance to succeed, and ensuring that, for those children who are permanently excluded, this is also the start of something new and positive. This matters because the group we are talking about includes some of society's most vulnerable and disadvantaged children, including children with certain special educational needs (as well as mental health problems) and children that have a social worker.

I attach the Government's response to your review, which includes four core commitments:

1. We will always support head teachers to maintain safe and orderly environments for the benefit of all pupils and staff in their schools;
2. We will support schools and their partners to put in place effective interventions to give pupils at risk of exclusion the best chance to succeed;
3. We will provide greater clarity for school leaders about when and how it is appropriate for children to be removed from their school, and make sure there is sufficient oversight when pupils move around the education system; and
4. We will support schools and providers of alternative provision so that pupils who have been excluded from school continue to benefit from high quality education.

The Government response sets out how we will deliver on these commitments, including our intention to drive a place-based, local, collective focus on the outcomes and experiences of children who are excluded, or who are at risk of exclusion, and to reduce disparities in exclusion rates between different groups. To achieve this:

1. **We will make schools accountable for the outcomes of permanently excluded children.** Over the summer, we will work with education leaders to design a consultation, to be launched in the autumn, on how to deliver these reforms in practice. In consulting, we will consider how to reform school accountability for children who are excluded; and will explore ways to enable schools to fulfil these new accountabilities for permanently excluded children, through reform to commissioning and funding arrangements for alternative provision. We will also seek views on how to mitigate the potential unintended consequences you identify in your review, including how to tackle the practice of 'off-rolling'.
2. **We will establish a practice programme that embeds effective partnership working between LAs, schools, alternative provision and other partners** to better equip schools to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion and to ensure that the most effective provision is put in place for those who are excluded. We will build on the excellent practice you have seen during the review and recent research commissioned by DfE.
3. **We will work with sector experts, led by the Department's lead advisor on behaviour, Tom Bennett, to rewrite our guidance** (including on exclusions, and on behaviour and discipline in schools) by summer 2020, to

address the uncertainty you have found and give head teachers confidence when making difficult decisions about behaviour and exclusions.

4. **We now call on Directors of Children's Services, governing bodies, academy trusts and local forums of schools to review information on children who leave schools, by exclusion or otherwise, and to establish a shared understanding of how the data on the characteristics of such children feeds local trends.** In revising our guidance, we will clarify our expectation that this information should be used to inform improvements in practice and reduce disparities, with particular reference to those groups more likely to be excluded nationally, including children with certain special educational needs (as well as mental health problems), and children who have a social worker. To help reduce ethnic disparities in school exclusions, it is particularly important to track patterns of exclusions by ethnicity, including assessing whether pupils of a particular background are more likely to be excluded.
5. **We will work with Ofsted to define and tackle the practice of 'off-rolling'**, whereby children are removed from school rolls without formal exclusion, in ways that are in the interests of the school rather than the pupil. We believe this practice is relatively rare, but we are clear that it is unacceptable. Ofsted will publish its revised inspection handbook shortly and we will continue to work with Ofsted to support its inspection and reporting to uphold the standards of leadership that we expect from all school leaders.
6. **We will extend support for alternative provision (AP).** In the autumn, we will set out plans to go further to improve outcomes for children in AP, including how we will support AP providers to attract and develop high-quality staff through a new AP workforce programme; and how we will help commissioners and providers to identify and recognise good practice.

I attach an annex to this letter which sets out our intention against each of our commitments, as well as a fuller response to each of your recommendations. I want to see these reforms implemented successfully so that no child misses out on the education they deserve and so I will update on the Government's progress in a year's time and regularly thereafter.

Finally, I want to address the issue of violent crime – particularly knife crime – which has tragically taken the lives of so many young people. We know that the issues surrounding serious violence, anti-social behaviour and absence and exclusion from school are complex, which is why we are working with the education and care sectors, Home Office and other departments as part of a comprehensive, multi-agency response. Whilst exclusion is a marker for increased risk of being both a victim and perpetrator of crime, we must be careful not to draw a simple causal link between exclusions and knife crime, as there is no clear evidence to back this up. I am clear, though, that engagement with – and success in – education is a protective factor for children. That is why we must prioritise measures outlined in your Review, particularly with regards to improving the quality of alternative provision. The measures outlined in this Government response will play a key role in ensuring that every young person is safe and free to fulfil their potential away from violent crime.

I am copying this letter to HM Chief Inspector, Amanda Spielman, who will respond separately to the recommendations you have made to Ofsted. I am also placing a copy of the review in the libraries of both Houses of Parliament, alongside the Government response.

Once again, I would like to thank you, and the schools, local authorities, parents, carers and children who responded to your call for evidence, attended roundtables, or hosted visits from you and your team. In responding to your review, we will take a similarly collaborative and consultative approach. This will allow us to learn from those who carry out valuable and often challenging work teaching, supporting, and caring for excluded children and those who are at risk of exclusion.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Damian Hinds". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D' and a long horizontal stroke for the 'i'.

**Rt Hon Damian Hinds MP**

**Secretary of State for Education**

# The Timpson Review of School Exclusion: Government Response

## **1. We will always support head teachers to maintain safe and orderly environments for the benefit of all pupils and staff in their schools.**

Your review rightly highlights the importance of supporting head teachers to establish strong school behaviour cultures. We know that high standards of attainment are facilitated by high standards for behaviour. We will support head teachers to create calm and ordered environments, supported by strong behaviour management systems, so that pupils from every background – including those who are vulnerable – can benefit from a school culture where teachers can teach and pupils can learn.

Poor behaviour impacts negatively on both the pupil who is the disrupter, and the other pupils in the classroom. It disrupts teaching and is a key driver of teacher workload and stress, for both classroom teachers and school leaders. We also know that a positive school culture – including good pupil behaviour – is crucial for teacher retention.

We support the difficult decisions that head teachers have to make, for the benefit of the whole school community, and back them to make use of both fixed term exclusions ('suspensions') and permanent exclusions ('expulsions'). The Government is committed to ensuring that all teachers are equipped with the skills to address both the serious behaviour issues that compromise the safety and wellbeing of pupils and school staff, and the low-level disruption that too often gets in the way of effective teaching.

Your review echoes findings from Tom Bennett's review of behaviour in schools ('Creating a Culture', 2016) that many teachers and school leaders would welcome greater support on how to manage and support pupils with challenging behaviour. They would like to understand better the causes of poor behaviour and the effective whole-school approaches and interventions they can adopt to address it.

We are investing £10 million to spread best practice in managing behaviour. Starting from September 2020, our behaviour support networks will involve lead schools, recognised for their excellent behaviour management, working alongside a team of experts, led by Tom Bennett, our lead adviser on behaviour, to bring about cultural changes in schools that want to turn-around their behaviour and reduce low-level disruption.

We also recently set out in our Recruitment and Retention Strategy our plans for the Early Career Framework to underpin a new entitlement for every new teacher to receive enhanced training in behaviour and classroom management, in the first two years of their career.

We will now go further and respond to your finding that school leaders spoke of the challenges of navigating and drawing clear messages from multiple guidance documents that deal with exclusions and behaviour. Working with sector experts, led by the department's lead advisor on behavior, Tom Bennett, we will publish clearer, more consistent guidance, by summer 2020. This includes guidance on managing behaviour, on the use of in-school units and the sorts of circumstances where it may be appropriate to use exclusion. We will also return to referring to

fixed term exclusion as 'suspension' and permanent exclusion as 'expulsion', to prevent confusion and conflation between the two terms.

Taken together, this will address the uncertainty amongst some school leaders about what good practice looks like, and give heads the confidence to act decisively when that is needed.

## **2. We will support schools and their partners to put in place effective interventions to give pupils at risk of exclusion the best chance to succeed.**

Teachers go into teaching to be ambitious for all children in their class. Where children have had a difficult start, they want to support them to overcome their circumstances so that they can go on to succeed at school and in later life.

No head teacher wants to permanently exclude. Head teachers who have to make these difficult decisions need to show great moral leadership in balancing the best course of action for individual children and for all pupils in their school.

Most schools are already effective in supporting children to remain engaged in education. Exclusion rates have risen, but they are lower than they were a decade ago, and permanent exclusion remains a rare event. Nonetheless, you have found evidence of variation in exclusion rates and practice beyond the natural variation that arises from differing local contexts.

The analysis informing your review has found that, even after accounting for other factors, some ethnic groups are associated with a lower likelihood of being permanently excluded than White British children, including Bangladeshi and Indian children, while children from other ethnic groups are more likely to be permanently excluded, in particular Black Caribbean and Mixed White and Black Caribbean pupils. Furthermore, your review found that, when other factors about their background are taken into account, financially disadvantaged children, children with certain types of special educational needs, and Children in Need are more likely to be excluded than other children.

We agree there is no right number of exclusions. We know that, to be able to support children who are at risk of exclusion effectively – so that as many children as possible can remain in mainstream – schools need access to the right resources and to work in partnership with LAs, providers of alternative provision, social care, health services and other partners.

We will also do more to spread – to local areas which need to strengthen in this area – the good practice in partnership working by LAs, schools, AP providers and other public services which you have identified.

We will continue to introduce new mental health support teams and training for designated senior leads for mental health, and will consider how both can support children to stay in education and support excluded pupils. We are also funding the Whole School SEND consortium to equip the school workforce to deliver high-quality teaching to children with special education needs. Finally, the Children in Need review is looking at how we can improve the educational outcomes of Children in Need, including how schools recognise and respond where children have experienced adversity and trauma, and how they can take steps to support engagement in education and address challenging behaviour early.

We will now go further by driving a place-based, local, collective focus on the outcomes and experiences of children who are excluded, or who are at risk of exclusion. To achieve this, we will:

- make schools accountable for the outcomes of permanently excluded children. Over the summer, we will work with education leaders to design a consultation, to be launched in the autumn, on how to deliver these reforms in practice. In consulting, we will consider how to reform school accountability for children who are excluded; and will explore ways to enable schools to fulfil these new accountabilities for permanently excluded children, through reform to commissioning and funding arrangements for alternative provision. We will also seek views on how to mitigate the potential unintended consequences you identify in your review, including how to tackle the practice of ‘off-rolling’; and
- establish a practice programme that embeds effective partnership working between LAs, schools, alternative provision and other partners to better equip schools to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion and to ensure that the most effective provision is put in place for those who are excluded. In taking this forward, we will build on the excellent practice you have seen during the review and the research commissioned by the Department.

As a first step in seeking education leaders’ views on these issues, the department has recently launched a call for evidence on the funding arrangements for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities, and for those who need alternative provision (AP). Among other things, we are seeking information on whether current AP funding arrangements enable local authorities, schools and AP providers to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion from school, provide high quality AP and take collective responsibility for children in AP.

Finally, we welcome that Ofsted’s draft inspection framework continues to include consideration of exclusion, including the rates, patterns and reasons for exclusion, as well as any differences between groups of pupils and whether any pupils are repeatedly excluded. It is encouraging that the framework empowers inspectors to consider and question information where a school has unusually high numbers of pupils who are taken off roll, including those who are not formally excluded.

We now call on Directors of Children’s Services, governing bodies, academy trusts and local forums of schools to review information on children who leave schools, by exclusion or otherwise, and to establish a shared understanding of how the data on the characteristics of such children feeds local trends. In revising our guidance, we will clarify our expectation that this information should be used to inform improvements in practice and reduce disparities, with particular reference to those groups more likely to be excluded nationally, including children with certain special educational needs (as well as mental health problems), or children who have a social worker. To help reduce ethnic disparities in school exclusions, it is particularly important to track patterns of exclusions by ethnicity, including assessing whether pupils of a particular background are more likely to be excluded.

### **3. We will provide greater clarity for school leaders about when and how it is appropriate for pupils to be removed from their school, and make sure there is sufficient oversight when pupils move around the education system.**

It is right that a head teacher has the ability to exclude permanently when that last resort is needed. As your review makes clear, permanent exclusion is just one of several ways children move between education settings. Some may be withdrawn from school for education at another school, or at home; others may attend AP as an intervention to improve behaviour, or on a short-term basis during a fixed-period exclusion; others may move between mainstream schools through a ‘managed move’.

In addition to these moves, which are routinely undertaken with the child's best interests in mind, your review has encountered evidence that, in some cases, children are leaving mainstream education or moving between settings in circumstances that are primarily in the interests of their school. This kind of behaviour is deeply concerning.

In response to your review, the department will act to provide school leaders with clarity on when it is and is not appropriate for children to leave a school and for schools to remove a pupil from their register, including clear guidance on 'managed moves'. Ofsted will publish its revised inspection handbook shortly, and the department will continue to work with Ofsted to define and tackle off-rolling – that is, 'the practice of removing a pupil from the school register without a formal, permanent exclusion or by encouraging a parent to remove their child from the school roll, when the removal is primarily in the interests of the school rather than in the best interests of the pupil.'

The department will also respond to your wider call for greater oversight of pupil moves, to ensure that no pupils can 'slip through the net' and out of education. Every child is entitled to a high quality education, whether they are in mainstream or special schools, AP or at home.

On 2 April, the department began to consult on plans for each local authority to maintain a register of children not in school, including those being taught at home. This would provide local authorities with a picture of where children in their area are being educated outside schools. The consultation closes on 24 June. Alongside this work, the department is conducting a review of the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016, to help LAs provide effective oversight and to assist them to meet their statutory duties to try to identify children who are missing education.

Finally, your review has raised concerns about the number of school days a child can miss in a single year through multiple fixed-period exclusions, and the amount of time for which they can be excluded without other education being put in place. Currently a pupil can be subject to fixed period exclusion for a total of 45 days in a single year. Schools are required to put in place alternative provision after five consecutive days of exclusion. Every day out of school impacts on a child's attainment. After public consultation, the department will consider reducing the limit on the total number of days a pupil can be excluded, in one year, and whether to strengthen the requirement to arrange AP during fixed-period exclusions.

#### **4. We will support schools and AP providers to ensure that pupils who have been excluded from school continue to benefit from high-quality education.**

Exclusion from school must never mean exclusion from education. It is vital that, when young people are excluded from school, they still engage with high-quality education.

We know that AP has a vital role to play in this. There are many remarkable AP settings across the country where children are reengaged with education through the efforts of passionate and dedicated teachers and pastoral staff. Indeed, more than 84% of AP academies, free schools and PRUs were rated good or outstanding by Ofsted in March 2019.

The Government's ambition is for every child in AP to receive an excellent education and leave AP prepared for the next stage in their lives, whether that is in education, employment or training. This is a particular priority because many pupils in AP have additional needs, are disadvantaged or are in contact with children's social services. Approximately 80% of pupils in state place-funded AP have SEN; 26% needed a social worker in the last 6 years; 40% are eligible for and are claiming Free School Meals. It follows that AP settings should be of the highest quality and should offer the best support available to meet their needs.

Since we launched our vision for reforming AP last March, we have made progress by launching a £4 million AP Innovation Fund, which is developing best practice and delivering projects to improve outcomes for pupils in AP; by publishing two research reports, which include examples of good practice for providers and commissioners of AP; and by opening six AP free schools and announcing the approval of two more. But we know there is more we can do to support AP providers and enable them to deliver the very best for every child.

In the autumn, we will set out plans to go further to improve outcomes for children in AP, including more on how we will support AP providers to attract and develop high-quality staff through a new AP workforce programme, and how we will help commissioners and providers to identify and recognise good practice. It is also vital that children in AP have access to high quality facilities so that they receive a curriculum on a par with mainstream. The spending review will set future capital budgets for improving and expanding buildings and facilities, including those for children who may require AP. We welcome the recommendations made in your review, which will inform the next stage of our AP reform programme.



Department  
for Education

## **Annex 1: the Government Response to Recommendations made by Edward Timpson's Review of School Exclusions**

**May 2019**

Recommendation	Government Response
<p>DfE should update statutory guidance on exclusions to provide more clarity on the use of exclusion. DfE should also ensure all relevant, overlapping guidance (including behaviour management, exclusions, mental health and behaviour, guidance on the role of the designated teacher for looked after and previously looked after children and the SEND Code of Practice) is clear, accessible and consistent in its messages to help schools manage additional needs, create positive behaviour cultures, make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010 and use exclusion only as last resort, when nothing else will do. Guidance should also include information on robust and well-evidenced strategies that will support schools embedding this in practice. <b>(Recommendation 1)</b></p> <p>DfE should strengthen guidance so that in-school units are always used constructively and are supported by good governance. <b>(Recommendation 7)</b></p> <p>DfE should use best practice on managed moves gathered by this review and elsewhere to enable them to consult and issue clear guidance on how they should be conducted, so that they are used consistently and effectively. <b>(Recommendation 23)</b></p>	<p><b>The Department for Education will work with sector experts, led by the department’s lead adviser on behaviour, Tom Bennett, to publish clearer, more consistent guidance by summer 2020.</b></p> <p><b>This will include departmental guidance on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>‘Behaviour and discipline in schools’</b></li> <li>• <b>‘Exclusions from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England’</b></li> <li>• <b>‘Mental health and behaviour in schools’</b></li> <li>• <b>‘Promoting the education of looked-after and previously looked-after children’</b></li> <li>• <b>‘The designated teacher for looked-after and previously looked-after children’.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>For the first time, we will provide guidance on the use of in-school units and ‘managed moves.’ We will also revise the SEND Code of Practice before the end of 2020.</b></p> <p><b>We will also return to referring to fixed term exclusion as ‘suspension’ and permanent exclusion as ‘expulsion’, to prevent confusion and conflation between the two terms.</b></p> <p><b>Taken together, this will address the uncertainty amongst some school leaders about what good practice looks like, and will give heads the confidence to act decisively when that is needed.</b></p>

DfE should set the expectation that schools and LAs work together, and in doing so, should clarify the powers of LAs to act as advocates for vulnerable children, working with mainstream, special and AP schools and other partners to support children with additional needs or who are at risk of leaving their school, by exclusion or otherwise. LAs should be enabled to facilitate and convene meaningful local forums that all schools are expected to attend, who meet regularly, share best practice and take responsibility for collecting and reviewing data on pupil needs and moves, and for planning and funding local AP provision, including early intervention for children at risk of exclusion. **(Recommendation 2)**

DfE should establish a Practice Improvement Fund of sufficient value, longevity and reach to support LAs, mainstream, special and AP schools to work together to establish effective systems to identify children in need of support and deliver good interventions for them. The fund should support effective partnership working to commission and fund AP and enable schools to create positive environments, target support effectively and provide the opportunity to share their best practice successfully. This should include developing best practice on areas including:

- internal inclusion units
- effective use of nurture groups and programmes
- transition support at both standard and non-standard transition points and across all ages
- approaches to engaging parents and carers
- creating inclusive environments, especially for children from ethnic groups with higher rates of exclusion

**The department shares Edward Timpson’s ambition to enable schools to work more closely with local authorities and AP providers to intervene early for those at risk of exclusion from school.**

**We will drive a place-based, local, collective focus on the outcomes and experiences of children who are excluded, or who are at risk of exclusion. To achieve this, we will:**

- **make schools accountable for the outcomes of permanently excluded children. Over the summer, we will work with education leaders to design a consultation, to be launched in the autumn, on how to deliver these reforms in practice. In consulting, we will consider how to reform school accountability for children who are excluded; and will explore ways to enable schools to fulfil new accountabilities for permanently excluded children through reform to commissioning and funding arrangements for alternative provision. We will also seek views on how to mitigate the potential unintended consequences Edward Timpson has identified in his review, including how to tackle the practice of ‘off-rolling’.**
- **establish a practice programme that embeds effective partnership working between LAs, schools, alternative provision and other partners such as the police and health bodies to better equip schools to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion and to ensure that the most effective provision is put in place for those who are excluded. We will**

<p>proactive use of AP as an early intervention delivered in mainstream schools and through off-site placements <b>(Recommendation 8)</b></p> <p>DfE should make schools responsible for the children they exclude and accountable for their educational outcomes. They should consult on how to take this forward, working with schools, AP and LAs to design clear roles in which schools should have greater control over the funding for AP to allow them to discharge these duties efficiently and effectively. Funding should also be flexible enough to ensure schools are able to put in place alternative interventions that avoid the need for exclusion where appropriate, as well as fund AP after exclusion. <b>(Recommendation 14)</b></p> <p>In making changes that strengthen accountability around the use of exclusions, DfE should consider any possible unintended consequences and mitigate the risk that schools seek to remove children from their roll in other ways. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reviewing a ‘right to return’ period where children could return from home education to their previous school, and other approaches that will ensure that this decision is always made in the child’s best interests</li> <li>○ considering new safeguards and scrutiny that mitigate the risk of schools avoiding admitting children where they do not have the grounds to do so <b>(Recommendation 27)</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>build on the excellent practice Edward Timpson has seen during his review and recent research commissioned by DfE.</b></p>
<p>DfE should ensure there is well-evidenced, meaningful and accessible training and support for new and existing school leaders to develop, embed and maintain positive behaviour cultures. The £10 million</p>	<p><b>Poor behaviour disrupts teaching, impacts on pupil welfare and prevents pupils from achieving their best. The Government believes</b></p>

<p>investment in supporting school behaviour practice should enable leaders to share practical information on behaviour management strategies, including how to develop and embed a good understanding of how underlying needs can drive behaviour, into their culture. It should also facilitate peer support, where school leaders have the opportunity to learn from high performing leaders who have a track record in this area.</p> <p><b>(Recommendation 3)</b></p>	<p><b>it is important that school leaders and teachers are supported to develop their practice in behaviour management.</b></p> <p><b>As we set out in our Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy, we are reforming training so that all new teachers will be shown how to effectively manage behaviour in their first two years in the profession, and have recently announced that we are investing £10 million to spread best practice in managing behaviour. Starting from September 2020, our behaviour support networks will involve lead schools, recognised for their excellent behaviour management, working alongside a team of experts, led by Tom Bennett, our lead adviser on behaviour, to bring about cultural changes in schools that want to turn-around their behaviour and reduce low-level disruption.</b></p>
<p>DfE should extend funding to equality and diversity hubs (an initiative to increase the diversity of senior leadership teams in England’s schools through training and support for underrepresented groups) beyond the current spending review period and at a level that widens their reach and impact. <b>(Recommendation 4)</b></p>	<p><b>It is vital to promote diversity in the school workforce, and the Equality and Diversity hubs play an important role in offering tailored leadership opportunities to aspiring leaders from under-represented groups. We will continue to promote diversity within the school workforce and will consider this recommendation as part of the spending review process.</b></p> <p><b>We are also strongly supportive of the ‘Everyone on Board’ campaign run by Inspiring Governance and the National Governance Association, which has already reported 17.8% of successful matches to governing boards were people from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds, last year (2018), compared to an average of around 4% among current governors.</b></p>
<p>To support the school workforce to have the knowledge and skills they need to manage behaviour and meet pupil needs, DfE should ensure that accessible, meaningful and substantive training on behaviour is a</p>	<p><b>The Early Career Framework (ECF), launched by the department as part of the teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy, announced a specific new entitlement for every new teacher to receive enhanced</b></p>

<p>mandatory part of initial teacher training and is embedded in the Early Career Framework. This should include expert training on the underlying causes of poor behaviour (including attachment, trauma and speech, language and communication needs, among others), and strategies and tools to deal effectively with poor behaviour when this arises.</p> <p><b>(Recommendation 5)</b></p>	<p><b>training in behaviour and classroom management in the first two years of their career.</b></p> <p><b>The ECF provides the starting point for a review of the guidance on core content for Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers. We will work closely with stakeholders and experts in the sector to strengthen ITT, by updating our core content guidance to complement the ECF. This will include consideration of training on managing behaviour and meeting pupil needs.</b></p> <p><b>Our statutory guidance for Virtual School Heads and Designated Teachers for Looked-After and Previously Looked-After Children places an emphasis on whole-school awareness of the impact of trauma and attachment disorders. We will consider the need for further training and support on attachment and trauma as part of the Children in Need Review.</b></p>
<p>To ensure designated senior leads for mental health and SENCOs are effective, DfE should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ review the training and support available to SENCOs to equip them to be effective in their operational and strategic role as SEND leaders</li> <li>○ ensure the training designated senior leads receive includes a specific focus on attachment and trauma.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Recommendation 6)</b></p>	<p><b>We welcome the additional evidence gathered by this report and recognise the need to ensure that SENCOs and Designated Senior Leads have access to specialist support to help them identify additional needs and put in place effective interventions.</b></p> <p><b>To support new SENCOs, we are funding the development of a SENCO induction pack and a guide for school leaders in the most effective deployment of SENCOs according to setting. We are also reviewing the learning outcomes for the Masters level National Award in SEN Coordination (NASENCO) that new SENCOs are required to achieve, to ensure that they reflect the changing needs of the educational system.</b></p> <p><b>We will support schools and colleges to train a Designated Senior Lead for Mental Health, free of charge. This training will enable senior</b></p>

	<p>leads to set up an effective whole school/college approach to mental health and wellbeing. This will include how to incorporate mental health and wellbeing in the design of behaviour policies, curriculum and pastoral support; how staff are supported with their own mental wellbeing; and how pupils and parents are engaged.</p> <p>The department published updated ‘Mental Health and Behaviour in Schools’ advice in November 2018. This advice helps schools to identify pupils whose behaviour may be a result of an underlying mental health difficulty, and how to support them, within an approach to behaviour that is based on clear expectations. The advice contains specific information about how schools can support pupils through Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and on whole school trauma and attachment awareness. This guidance will be revised in response to Edward Timpson’s review.</p>
<p>DfE should promote the role of AP in supporting mainstream and special schools to deliver effective intervention and recognise the best AP schools as teaching schools (and any equivalent successors), and actively facilitate the sharing of expertise between AP and the wider school system. <b>(Recommendation 9)</b></p> <p>To ensure AP can attract the staff they need, DfE should take steps to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ensure AP is both an attractive place to work and career choice, with high-quality staff well-equipped to provide the best possible academic and pastoral support for the children who need it most. DfE should consider ways to boost interest in and exposure to AP through new teacher training placement opportunities in AP</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternative provision (AP) has a vital role to play for pupils who have been excluded, and we know that there are many remarkable AP settings across the country where children are reengaged with education through the efforts of passionate and dedicated leaders, teachers and support staff.</b></p> <p><b>Since we launched our AP roadmap in March 2018, we have made significant progress by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>launching a £4 million AP Innovation Fund which is developing best practice and delivering projects to improve outcomes for pupils in AP;</b></li> <li>• <b>publishing examples of good practice for providers and commissioners of AP; and</b></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ better understand and act upon the current challenges with the workforce in AP, by backing initiatives to support its development, in particular focusing on making sure there is action taken to develop and invest in high-quality inspirational leaders in AP that have the capacity to drive improvement across the school network. <b>(Recommendation 10)</b></li> </ul> <p>Alongside measures to improve the quality of AP, PRUs should be renamed to reflect their role as both schools and places to support children to overcome barriers to engaging in their education. <b>(Recommendation 11)</b></p> <p>DfE should invest in significantly improving and expanding buildings and facilities for pupils who need AP. As a priority, DfE should carefully consider the right level of capital funding to achieve this, for the next spending review. <b>(Recommendation 12)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● opening 6 AP free schools and approving two more.</li> </ul> <p><b>Our ambition is for every child in AP to receive an excellent education, and for AP to be recognised as an integral part of the education system. We welcome the recommendations made by Edward Timpson’s review, which will inform the next stage of our AP reform programme. This will include consideration of whether changes may be needed to the naming of PRUs and the means of sharing expertise between the AP sector and mainstream.</b></p> <p><b>It is also vital that children in AP have access to the high quality facilities so that they receive a curriculum on a par with mainstream. The spending review will set future capital budgets for improving and expanding buildings and facilities, including those for children who may require AP.</b></p> <p><b>In the autumn, we will set out plans to go further to improve outcomes for children in AP, including more on how we will support AP providers to attract and develop high-quality staff through a new AP workforce programme, and how we will help commissioners and providers to identify and recognise good practice.</b></p>
<p>The Government should continue to invest in approaches that build multi-disciplinary teams around schools, and should identify any capacity concerns and work across Departments to ensure that schools are supported and work productively with all relevant agencies, including Health and Social Care. <b>(Recommendation 13)</b></p>	<p><b>The Government welcomes Edward Timpson’s support for our work to ensure that schools are supported by other agencies in meeting the needs of children in their care. We will continue to act to strengthen links between schools and other services. For example, in relation to health and social care we are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● introducing new mental health support teams and training designated senior leads for mental health;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishing the SEND System Leadership Board, which will be focussed on improving joint working and strategic commissioning between local education, health and social care partners;</li> <li>• funding the Whole School SEND Consortium to equip the school workforce to deliver high quality teaching across all types of SEN, and to build a Community of Practice involving 10,000 schools;</li> <li>• concluding the Children in Need Review, to understand what makes a difference to the educational outcomes of all children who need a social worker, and what more in policy and practice (both in and out of schools) would improve outcomes; and</li> <li>• trialling the use of social workers in schools by the What Works Centre for Children’s Social Care.</li> </ul>
<p>DfE should look carefully at the timing and amounts of any adjustments to schools’ funding following exclusion, to make sure they neither act as an incentive for schools to permanently exclude a pupil at particular times, nor discourage a school from admitting a child who has been permanently excluded from elsewhere. <b>(Recommendation 15)</b></p>	<p><b>In December 2018, as part of the announcement of £250 million of extra high needs funding for local authorities, up to 2020, the department announced that there would be a call for evidence in 2019.</b></p> <p><b>This call for evidence started on 3 May and will close on 31 July. Among other things, it is seeking information on whether current funding arrangements enable local authorities, schools and AP providers to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion from school, provide high quality AP and take collective responsibility for delivering best value from the funding available. After reviewing the</b></p>

	<p>evidence, we will consider whether improvements could be made to the current funding arrangements.</p> <p>Evidence can be submitted at the following link:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/send-and-ap-provision-call-for-evidence">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/send-and-ap-provision-call-for-evidence</a></p>
<p>DfE should work with others to build the capacity and capability of governors and trustees to offer effective support and challenge to schools, to ensure exclusion and other pupil moves such as managed moves and direction into AP are always used appropriately. This should include training as well as new, accessible guidance for governors and trustees. <b>(Recommendation 17)</b></p>	<p><b>The department recognises the importance of governing boards and school leadership working together to ensure schools are well run, including working in the best interests of pupils where exclusions (whether fixed-period or permanent) or other pupil moves take place.</b></p> <p><b>We will review our guidance for governors, including that in ‘Exclusions from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England’ and ‘Understanding your Data: a guide for school governors and academy trustees’.</b></p>
<p>Local authorities should include information about support services for parents and carers of children who have been, or are at risk of, exclusion, or have been placed in AP, in their SEND Local Offer. DfE should also produce more accessible guidance for parents and carers. In the longer term, the Government should invest resources to increase the amount of information, advice and support available locally to parents and carers of children who are excluded or placed in AP. <b>(Recommendation 18)</b></p>	<p><b>We recognise the need for better signposting for parents and carers. We will update guidance for parents as recommended, and will consider how to meet the recommendations on Local Offers and Information, Advice and Support Services.</b></p>
<p>Governing bodies, academy trusts and local forums of schools should review information on children who leave their schools, by exclusion or otherwise, and understand how such moves feed into local trends. They should work together to identify where patterns indicate possible concerns or gaps in provision, and use this information to ensure they are</p>	<p><b>Edward Timpson’s review identifies that 78% of permanent exclusions were issued to children who had SEN, were classified as in need or were eligible for free school meals. 11% of permanent exclusions were to children with all three characteristics.</b></p> <p><b>The additional analysis conducted for the review also presented greater insight into the association between ethnicity and a child’s</b></p>

<p>effectively planning to meet the needs of all children. <b>(Recommendation 19)</b></p>	<p>likelihood of being excluded, and revealed a complex picture, with the links between ethnicity and exclusion differing across ethnic groups.</p> <p>We agree that, since circumstances vary for each child, and the influence of out-of-school factors will vary according to local context, it is important that schools, LAs and local partners work together to understand what lies behind local trends. Directors of Children's Services, governing bodies, academy trusts and local forums of schools should review information on children who leave schools, by exclusion or otherwise, and establish a shared understanding of how the data on the characteristics of such children feeds local trends.</p> <p>In revising our guidance, we will clarify our expectation that this information should be used to inform improvements in practice and reduce disparities, with particular reference to those groups more likely to experience exclusion, nationally, including children with certain special educational needs (as well as mental health problems), or children who have a social worker. To help reduce ethnic disparities in school exclusions, it is particularly important that local leaders should track patterns of exclusions by ethnicity, including assessing whether pupils of a particular background are more likely to be excluded.</p>
<p>DfE should publish the number and rate of exclusions of previously looked after children who have left local authority care via adoption, Special Guardianship Order or Child Arrangement Order. <b>(Recommendation 20)</b></p>	<p>Although we encourage adoptive parents to self-declare, the Government respects the right of parents to choose whether or not to declare that their child is adopted. As some choose not to, the coverage may not be at a level to give truly robust data. However, we still believe there would be value in publishing exclusions data for previously looked after children (including adopted children), and will look to do so as soon as possible. This will allow us to build on the</p>

	<p>action we have already taken to support the outcomes of previously looked after children, such as ensuring they receive Pupil Premium Plus and have priority admission to schools.</p>
<p>DfE should consult on options to address children with multiple exclusions being left without access to education. This should include considering placing a revised limit on the total number of days a pupil can be excluded for or revisiting the requirements to arrange AP in these periods. <b>(Recommendation 21)</b></p>	<p><b>Edward Timpson’s review has raised concerns about the number of school days a child can miss in a single year, due to repeated fixed-period exclusion, and the amount of time for which they can be excluded, without other education being put in place.</b></p> <p>Currently, a pupil can be subject to fixed period exclusion for a total of 45 days in a single year. Schools are required to put in place alternative provision (AP) after five <i>consecutive</i> days of exclusion. It is possible for a child to reach the 45 day limit through multiple short exclusions of 5 days or less without other education being put in place, though such cases are rare.</p> <p>Every day out of school impacts on a child’s attainment. After public consultation, the department will consider reducing the limit on the total number of days a pupil can be excluded, in one year, and whether to strengthen the requirement to arrange AP during fixed-period exclusions.</p>
<p>DfE should review the range of reasons that schools provide for exclusions when submitting data, and make any necessary changes, so that the reasons that lie behind exclusions are more accurately captured. <b>(Recommendation 22)</b></p>	<p><b>Guidance to schools is clear that the ‘other’ category should be used sparingly, and we agree it is concerning that almost a fifth of all permanent and fixed period exclusions were recorded under this code in 2016/17. We will work with schools to understand the circumstances in which the code ‘other’ is being used and will update the list of options available to improve our data on reasons for exclusion.</b></p>
<p>DfE must take steps to ensure there is sufficient oversight and monitoring of schools’ use of AP, and should require schools to submit information</p>	<p><b>When schools commission alternative provision (AP) for their pupils, they are responsible for ensuring placements meet children's needs,</b></p>

<p>on their use of off-site direction into AP through the school census. This should include information on why they have commissioned AP for each child, how long the child spends in AP and how regularly they attend. <b>(Recommendation 24)</b></p>	<p><b>including providing education on a par with mainstream schools, meeting children's personal, social and academic needs, and defining clear objectives for next steps, such as reintegration back into mainstream, further education, training or employment.</b></p> <p><b>Ofsted already monitors schools' use of AP for their pupils, and the department will consider how we can build the evidence base on schools' use of AP on a national level.</b></p>
<p>To increase transparency of when children move out of schools, where they move to and why, pupil moves should be systematically tracked. Local authorities should have a clear role, working with schools, in reviewing this information to identify trends, taking action where necessary and ensuring children are receiving suitable education at their destination. <b>(Recommendation 25)</b></p>	<p><b>The department is determined to ensure that every pupil can benefit from a high quality education. This includes society's most vulnerable and disadvantaged children such as those with certain SEN, as well as mental health problems, and children that have a social worker.</b></p> <p><b>We have already taken steps to aid local authorities in their statutory duties to try to identify children who are missing education. On 2 April, the department began to consult on plans for each local authority to maintain a register of children not in school, including those being taught at home. This would provide local authorities with a picture of where children in their area are being educated outside schools. The consultation closes on 24 June. Alongside this work, the department is conducting a review of the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016, to help LAs provide effective oversight.</b></p> <p><b>As noted above, the Department will consult on how LAs, schools and alternative provision settings can work together to take responsibility for children who are at risk of exclusion from school and who are placed in alternative provision. As part of this, we will consider the role of the local authority in tracking pupil moves.</b></p>

<p>Relevant regulations and guidance should be changed so that social workers must be notified alongside parents when a Child in Need is moved out of their school, whether through a managed move, direction off-site into AP or to home education, as well as involved in any processes for challenging, reconsidering or reviewing decisions to exclude. DfE's Children in Need review should consider how to take this forward so children's social care can best be involved in decisions about education and how best to ensure a child's safety and long-term outcomes. <b>(Recommendation 28)</b></p>	<p><b>The Children in Need review is investigating how we can improve the educational outcomes of children in need. The interim publication has already set out what schools can do to help children in need overcome the barriers they face, including examples of how schools have worked to address challenging behaviour and to make changes to practice which help them engage with education. This information can be found at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-children-in-need">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-children-in-need</a></b></p> <p><b>The Children in Need Review is now moving on to look at what more can be done in policy and practice, both in and out of school, to improve outcomes.</b></p>
<p>Real-time data on exclusions and other moves out of education should be routinely shared with Local Safeguarding Children Boards and their successors, Safeguarding Partners, so they can assess and address any safeguarding concerns such as involvement in crime. This should include information on exclusion by characteristic. <b>(Recommendation 29)</b></p> <p>The Government's £200 million Youth Endowment Fund, which is testing interventions designed to prevent children from becoming involved in a life of crime and violence, should be open to schools, including AP. This will enable the development of workable approaches of support, early intervention and prevention, for 10 to 14 year olds who are at most risk of youth violence, including those who display signs such as truancy from school, risk of exclusion, aggression and involvement in anti-social behaviour. <b>(Recommendation 30)</b></p>	<p><b>The Government is determined to protect young people from – and prevent their involvement in – violent crime. Serious violence is not something that schools can tackle alone, but schools and alternative providers can continue to play an important role in preventing young people from involvement in violent crime, working alongside health and community services, social services and the police. This includes through local Safeguarding Children Boards and their successors, Safeguarding Partners, who have a vital role in keeping children safe. Most local areas will be publishing revised arrangements by June 2019.</b></p> <p><b>On 23 March 2019, following a competitive bidding process, the Home Secretary announced that a new £200m Youth Endowment Fund will be operated by the charity Impetus, working in partnership with the Early Intervention Foundation and the Social Investment Business. The Fund will deliver long-term, sustainable change, delivering a ten-year programme of grants that will enable interventions targeted at those who are at most risk. It will act as a</b></p>

**centre of expertise; finding out which approaches are most effective; generating, disseminating and promoting new knowledge and practice to transform local and national responses. It will leverage impact by generating and securing additional funding and resources to deliver a lasting legacy.**

**Alongside this, the Home Secretary has launched a consultation paper on a multi-agency or ‘public health’ approach to knife crime. The consultation sets out options for the introduction of a new legal duty and a non-legislative option for partners to work together voluntarily to prevent and tackle serious violence. It also describes the Government’s commitment to investing in Violence Reduction Units (VRUs) in areas of England and Wales most affected by violent crime. These new units will bring together a range of relevant agencies, for example the police, health, education, social services and others, to develop a multi-agency approach to preventing serious violence. While the evidence does not support a simple causal link between exclusions and violent crime, exclusion is clearly a marker for increased risk of involvement. As the proposal develops, the department will therefore consider how VRUs could use data on local trends in exclusions and other pupil moves to inform their local strategies for tackling serious violence.**

**We urge those working in schools, AP providers and across the education system to contribute their views on how local partnerships can best work together to prevent serious violence. The consultation is available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/serious-violence-new-legal-duty-to-support-multi-agency-action>**

**This consultation closes on 28 May 2019.**



CCS0519157494

978-1-5286-1271-5