

## APPENDIX 1



## Report to Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny Committee 31.10.12

**Report of:** Maggie Williams, Deputy Executive Director, Children Young People and Families Portfolio

**Subject:** Every Child in Education Every Day

**Author of Report:** Sarah Draper, Assistant Director, Inclusion and Learning Services, Children, Young People and Families

### **Summary:**

This report provides an update on the “Every Child in Education Every Day” strand of work which is ensuring that, as a council, we are regularly addressing the key issues relating to behaviour and attendance across the city, at both an operational and strategic level. Recent government reports and guidance have resulted in the group closely examining and reviewing current policy and practice with a focus on how the Council can ensure that every child is accessing an appropriate education every day. The report also highlights the relationship between current policy in relation to the number of exclusions across the city and the function of Sheffield’s Pupil Referral Unit which is named “The Sheffield Inclusion Centre”.

***NB Throughout this paper reference to “schools” includes academies unless otherwise stated.***

**Type of item:** The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	<b>X</b>
Other	

## The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Note and endorse the direction of travel of the “Every Child in Education Every Day (ECIEED)” work and its four constituent strands, which are:
    1. Attendance/Persistent Absence
    2. Admission to schools
    3. Behaviour/Exclusion
    4. Curriculum Access
  - Discuss the potential impact that proposed changes in policy relating to exclusion may have; and,
  - Comment on the establishment of Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships across the secondary sector
- 

### Background Papers:

“They never give up on you”  
Report of the Office of the Children’s Commissioner, March 2012

“Improving Alternative Provision”  
Charlie Taylor, The Government’s Expert Adviser on Behaviour

“Exclusion from Maintained Schools, Academies and Pupil Referral Units in England” - A guide for those with legal responsibilities in relation to exclusion

Guidance on School Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships

**Category of Report:** OPEN

---

### 1. Introduction/Context

1.1 Being in full time education every day is recognised to contribute very positively and significantly to the life chances of all children and young people. Participation in education improves chances of employment and future economic well-being, creating the foundation for positive participation in both community and wider society and the basis for future successful families.

Children and young people who are not involved in full time education are at greater risk of becoming isolated, of underachieving and potentially becoming involved in crime, anti-social behaviour or in the abuse of drugs or alcohol.

Vulnerable children and young people are better safeguarded and at reduced risk of harm when in full time education every day.

1.2 The Every Child In Education Every Day (ECIEED) strand of work has been established in order to tackle any barriers that may exist for Sheffield children and young people in accessing appropriate education every day. It will ensure that key issues relating to this agenda maintain a consistently high profile and that appropriate actions are carried forward which had a direct positive impact for children and young people within Sheffield. The work is led by Sarah Draper - Assistant Director, Inclusion and Learning Services with representation from across the Children & Young People's portfolio.

1.3 As a result of the changing national guidance, there has been much local activity and interest in this agenda in the past six months.. This has led to the following range of activity: I

- Reporting to the 14-19 board with a focus on BME exclusions
- Contributing to a Members Workshop led by Cllr. Drayton which focussed on the importance of every child being in education every day
- Supporting training to Governors relating to permanent exclusions
- Co-ordinating the moratorium on "Supported Transfers" (to be explained later in this paper)
- Overseeing the re shaping of Behaviour Services across the city, with particular emphasis on the Pupil Referral Unit which is based at the following sites:
  - Key Stage 1 and 2 – Clifford Road
  - Key Stage 3 and 4 – Spring Lane
  - Home and Hospital – Spring Lane and Sheffield Children's Hospital
- Overseeing the work of the Behaviour Strategy Group which was established in March 2011 and has now completed its set tasks

The main aim of this report is to provide members with the current picture related to exclusions. However, in order to provide a wider context for the exclusion information, the following is an update and outline of the direction of travel on the first three strands of Every Child in School Every Day:

1. Attendance/Persistent Absence
2. Admission to schools
3. Curriculum Access

## **2. Attendance/Persistent Absence**

2.1 For Sheffield, and nationally, the main reasons for poor school attendance are:

- Illness;
- Religious Observance;
- Holidays in Term Time;
- Persistent Absence.

2.2 It has been acknowledged that the earlier families are supported to ensure regular school attendance the more chance there is of influencing attendance in later years. It has been established that for the last 2 years in Sheffield Y1 and Y2 have made up about 38% of the total absence for Sheffield primary schools. This supports the proposal to target work as early as foundation stage.

2.3 Persistent absentees are defined as having an overall absence rate of around 15% or more. This equates to 46 or more sessions of absence (authorised and unauthorised) during the year (half-terms 1-5). The reasons for persistent absence are wide ranging but often centre on social or emotional issues for the child or young person and/or for their family. Persistent absentees may for example be carers or may be part of a dysfunctional family unit. Other reasons for persistent absence may be related to the relationship between the child or young person and/or their family and the school which leads to disengagement.

#### 2.4 **Actions for 2012/13**

Following consultation, Sheffield will publish its new Attendance Strategy in the autumn term. The strategy has 5 key themes:

1. Schools' Own Management of Attendance
2. Early Intervention and Prevention
3. Support for Looked After Children
4. Local Authority Targeted Support for Schools
5. Full and Effective use Legal Powers

Improving School Attendance has to be everyone's business. The new attendance strategy supports the concept of 'Early Intervention & Prevention' and relies upon schools working closely in partnership with Children, Young People and Families and other partners to achieve this aim.

### 3. **Admission to Schools**

3.1 About 12,000 school admissions are processed every year in Sheffield and at the start of primary and secondary education, 97% of applications result in a place in a preferred school. However there are a number of reasons why school admission can result in children or young people missing from school including:

- A few parents who do not receive a place for their child in a preferred school may take the case to appeal and in the meantime choose not to send their child to school.
- Children who transfer between schools during the school year may be allocated a school place but, on occasion, their admission to school is delayed by the receiving school. The allocation of a place may take longer in over-subscribed schools as available places will be much reduced.

3.2 The council has a duty to trace and place any child that is not on a school roll. Children newly arrived in the city particularly from abroad are included in this category and it may take time before these children are

identified. The allocation of these children may also take longer than average if there are language barriers to be overcome or families have no experience of education or are living in areas where schools are fully subscribed.

### 3.3 **Actions for 2012/13**

- We believe it is good practice for us to question and try to reduce the high numbers of children and young people that transfer between schools. Research shows that transfer can hinder a child's progress and can lead to problems of attendance. We will highlight these issues in our communications with parents through the Parents Assembly and we will investigate individual applications to check that the parent is in agreement with the transfer request before it is processed.
- The Fair Access Protocol acts as a safety-net where the normal process of in-year admissions has failed. We need an updated agreement with schools which clarifies how the protocol will be used in primary schools, in respect of newly-arrived children and in response to the 2012 Admissions Code. The new code places greater importance on the locally agreed Fair Access Protocol as a guideline for whether schools might oppose the admission of a child in-year where the school has a particularly high proportion of children with challenging behaviour..

## 4. **Curriculum Access**

4.1 For a wide range of reasons young people may have all or part of their curriculum delivered off schools sites. Reasons include:

- Elected Home Education (EHE)
- Ill Health, both physical and mental
- Pregnancy
- Late arrival in Y11
- Motivational context to support other learning
- Early start to post-16 Education
- Specialist vocational learning outside of school.
- Provision to prevent young people becoming Neet

4.2 Children resident in Sheffield are taught on outreach when they are not well enough to return to school upon discharge from the hospital.

Children are usually taught on a one to one basis either:

- in their own home
- In the home of a relative or friend, through agreement with the parent/carer
- in a suitable local public venue
- at Spring Lane.

4.3 Around 1600 young people usually aged 15 -16 years attend off-site provision which is commissioned by schools to either enhance their mainstream offer or to provide a full time alternative to the school curriculum. Where this is planned and effectively monitored by the school this is often a positive experience which enables young people to

benefit from a vocational skills programme which is quality assured through the council.

- 4.4 In a minority of cases however, an alternative provider may be used which is not quality assured or attendance is not properly monitored by the school. This can be a cause for concern, particularly if non-attendance by a pupil is not addressed. This can result in a young person not being in education.

Schools have recently been reminded of the importance of using quality assured provision and work is being undertaken to identify where schools are not addressing issues of non-attendance.

4.5 **Actions for 2012/13**

- Further develop the relationships with parents/families of EHE children and improve systems for monitoring and supporting this group of children.
- Remind schools of their responsibility in relation to ensuring all off site provision is quality assured and effectively monitored/risk assessed

5. **Exclusions - The Current Situation in Sheffield**

5.1 **Formal Exclusions**

Exclusion is a legal sanction backed by clear Department for Education (DfE) guidance (September 2012) which schools can use when behaviour has breached expected standards.

It is expected the use of exclusion will be part of a school's behaviour policy with escalating steps, fairly and consistently applied, and communicated to parents and pupils and only as a "last resort".

In the exclusion process parents and carers have clear rights and schools have clear duties including providing for the education of the pupil during the period of exclusion up to 5 days. Beyond 5 days it is the duty of the council to provide alternative educational provision.

A fixed term exclusion is time limited and can be up to 45 days in a school year – usually it is for less than 5 days, often one or two days. In the case of a permanent exclusion the pupil does not return to the school.

The rate of exclusion varies according to different groups of the pupil population. BME groups are particularly over-represented in Sheffield. The data in appendix 1 demonstrates this.

School level data is also available and indicates considerable variation in rates of exclusion and groups involved.

5.2 **"Hidden Exclusions"**

There are several policies in Sheffield which could be considered to mask the real level of permanent exclusions. Informal/illegal exclusions

apply to those situations where a Headteacher sends a child home for disciplinary reasons and does not follow the formal exclusion process. An example of this is when a pupil is sent home to “cool off” or until a parent accompanies them to school. We do not know the number of these informal exclusions because there is no mechanism to capture the data. When officers become aware of them they are followed up and the school challenged on its practice.

### 5.3 **Supported Transfers**

This policy was adopted in September 2006 as an alternative to permanent exclusion as part of the zero exclusions policy and involves transfer from the school roll to that of the PRU (Pupil Referral Unit). It should only be used as a last resort when the school believes it has attempted every available strategy and the Headteacher considers that the pupil is at risk of permanent exclusion. Parental agreement must be obtained but the parent has no right of appeal.

The supported transfer procedure avoids a permanent exclusion being recorded on the pupil’s records. It requires the PRU to have an open ended number of places and in the process there is no role for Sheffield City Council (SCC) to act as advocate for the child. The headline data for the number of supported transfers is found in the attached appendix 1.

It should be noted that statistically, pupils with a permanent exclusion shown on their school record may have a greater chance of being unemployed or being involved in criminal activity. The introduction therefore, of the supported transfer process, was intended to reduce permanent exclusions and enhance the life chances of vulnerable pupils. However, it is clear from the high number of supported transfers and the concern expressed, particularly by parents, that this system is not working. There is real concern that this current policy is having a direct negative impact on the number of children/young people who are educated outside of the mainstream system.

In 2010/11, the number of pupils referred to the Key Stage 3/4 PRU through either supported transfer or permanent exclusion was 32% higher than in 2005/6 (115/152), yet the resource did not increase. Due to the increase in the number of supported transfers, the capacity to accommodate intervention referrals to the PRU at Key Stage 3/4 has reduced. In 2010/11 the number of interventions were 56% lower than in 2006/7 (28/64). This has a direct negative impact on early intervention.

In order to build additional capacity at Spring Lane the service currently uses 27 vocational providers which enables the PRU to offer more provision to pupils in Key Stage 4 as the KS4 current provision cannot manage the number of pupils who are referred. The provision is funded and staffed to manage 135 pupils, yet the numbers in September 2012 were 166. As the resource at Spring Lane is currently over-subscribed there is a direct impact on children being either on a waiting list or being offered only a part time time-table. Clearly this is not acceptable.

In summary, evidence indicates that the introduction of Supported Transfers has resulted in a sharp increase in children and young people being referred to the PRU and subsequently “excluded” from mainstream education.

## **6. Pupil Movement across the City**

6.1 A number of children who access their education in a Sheffield school may experience challenges in maintaining their school placement, particularly if the child presents challenging behaviour. For some of these children the school may explore a range of options in order to maintain the child in education by accessing a placement at an alternative school. The process for “moving children on” includes both SWAPP and Managed Moves.

6.2 **SWAPP** (students wanting alternative placement panels). These are Headteacher led panels with no role for SCC as the advocate for the child. Pupils displaying disruptive behaviour are discussed and the option of a “fresh start” in another school considered. Arrangements for transfer between schools at the panel are then agreed, if considered appropriate. Parental agreement is required but the parent has no recourse to appeal. It is again difficult to quantify the number of these transfers.

There have been a number of instances where SWAPP placements have broken down and the child has been left without a school place. As this arrangement is often managed on an informal basis, children and families can be left confused and frustrated when they are refused access at their original school.

6.3 **Managed Moves**  
This is an agreed, supported and planned transfer between schools which takes place when a school feels a pupil is approaching permanent exclusion. This is a formal process and requires the involvement of CYPF. Conducted in this formal way it is an approach used in many local authorities. The data can be found in the attached appendix 1.

6.4 There is an acknowledgment by the LA and some schools that the systems outlined in 6.2 and 6.3 do not work consistently or, in some cases, effectively for children and young people. The processes give cause for concern to at least some parents as well as to some schools and therefore, there is a need for this practice to be re-visited.

## **7. Vulnerable Groups**

7.1 In ensuring every child is in education every day CYPF, on behalf of SCC, will act as the advocate and champion for children, young people and their families, especially for those who are vulnerable including children who:

- have un-met learning needs
- have complex families who require support from professionals



- have had more than one school move in either the primary or secondary sector
- have been subject to more than one fixed term exclusion in one school term
- are looked after
- have a record of persistent absence from school
- are at risk of either fixed or permanent exclusion

Sheffield City Council intends to place the needs of children and young people at the heart of its direction and decision making.

## **8. Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships**

8.1 The aim of establishing Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships, initially in the secondary sector, is to promote outstanding behaviour and levels of attendance in all Sheffield Secondary Schools. Many Local Authorities have already established such partnerships which have proved to have a positive impact on reducing exclusions and raising attendance. Whilst these partnerships are no longer government policy, implementation has proved to be beneficial in other Local Authorities.

8.2 Through effective local partnership working, schools will have a forum to learn from one another and collaborate with the sole aim of driving forward high standards and expectations of behaviour and attendance. Schools are committed to working together to deliver the very best outcomes for their students by supporting one another and providing forums to share good practice.

8.3 The aims and purpose of the partnerships are as follows:

- Create a strategy which promotes outstanding behaviour and attendance in schools.
- Active engagement of all schools within their clusters.
- Active engagement of the PRU, other providers of alternative provision and extended services.
- Disseminate good practice and strategies already taking place within schools.
- Share resources to meet the individual needs of schools within the cluster.
- Guaranteed effectiveness of Fair Access and Managed Moves policy.
- Focus on early interventions.
- A coherent SWAPP initiative running in each cluster.
- A supportive staff training programme.
- An improvement in Secondary School Attendance that is in line or above the national average.
- A commitment to minimising permanent exclusions, supported transfers and managed moves through the development of targeted, preventative and co-ordinated provision which meets the needs of students who require such interventions.

## **9. Strategy for Tackling Exclusions**

- 9.1 There is a clear need for Sheffield City Council to develop a clear strategy for tackling the high number of exclusions across the city. The following proposals/actions have been identified and in some cases actioned:

### **1. Policy**

By the end of December we aim to:

- a. Review, with a view to ending, zero permanent exclusions policy (Supported Transfers).
- b. Members Task and Finish Group –one meeting has taken place to explore the implications of ending the zero permanent exclusions policy
- c. Present this paper to the Scrutiny Committee for comments on direction of travel
- d. Place an interim moratorium on supported transfers and informed all schools of this action
- e. Establish Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships
- f. Formalise the Managed Moves/SWAPP processes to ensure the advocacy role of SSC is robust in the process
- g. Review and if necessary revise the Fair Access Protocol
- h. Consider the linkages between these policies and the Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships to secure peer challenge as well as officer engagement.

### **2. Reinforce with schools their responsibilities and SCC expectations in relation to exclusions.**

By the end of November we aim to:

- a. Use the new DFE statutory guidance on exclusions as a basis for reminding schools of their role and responsibilities.
- b. State the role of SCC as an advocate for children and families in respect of providing appropriate challenge when required.
- c. Provide training for Governors/Headteachers in partnership with Legal Services.
- d. Develop a model behaviour policy framework for schools based on best practice

### **3. Develop collaborative working between SCC and Headteachers**

In the Spring Term, 2013, we aim to:

- a. Develop locality based collaborative working through the Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships which will promote:
  - Early intervention and prevention approaches with particular reference to BME
  - Inclusive practice
  - Links with the teaching school (secondary).
  - The further development of quality assured Alternative Provision

- b. Continue to develop outreach through the PRU particularly with groups of primary schools as well as individual ones.

#### **4. Sheffield City Council - Monitoring and Challenge Role**

We have already begun to:

- a. Monitor exclusions using newly developed systems on termly basis and challenge schools where necessary and in particular with reference to BME exclusions (monitoring through officer group initially)
- b. Challenge informal exclusions with particular reference to looked after children.
- c. Screen applications for school-to-school transfer applications to ensure that transfer requests have appropriate parental support.

#### **5. Data and information – systematic collection and use**

We intend to continue to develop:

- a. The Referral Team which has been established within the Pupil Referral Unit from September 2012. This team is currently and will continue to analyse all exclusion data.
- b. The effective analysis of data by the Referral Team will enable CYPF to identify and mobilise services as required, in addition to offering appropriate support to schools to develop alternative behaviour management interventions for individuals or groups and also to challenge current practice.
- c. Support interventions which could come either from established services including the Pupil Referral Unit or may be available to schools from other quality assured providers. The early identification of children requiring support and the development of alternative interventions should contribute to reducing the frequency of fixed or permanent exclusions.
- d. The analysis of exclusion data which is already being monitored by a group of senior officers from across CYPF on a termly basis to identify schools where trends in overall exclusions or in respect of specific groups are of concern. The data will be compared annually with national trends. This process allows identification of schools where it may be necessary to provide both challenge and support regarding their practice. This equally applies when information is received about informal exclusion from school.

#### **6. Information**

We will continue to improve our systems to enable us to:

- a. Signpost schools to quality assured projects and services including those offered by voluntary community sector.
- b. Establish and publicise advice and guidance - “One Stop Shop” for parents in respect of exclusions – link to corporate customer single point of contact.

## **7. Engagement**

We will ensure by the end of December we have:

- a. Engaged with parents and young people, especially BME groups to seek views and also to develop confidence and empower parents, building on two previous BME parent meetings
- b. Engage with the BME network
- c. Plan a programme for engagement with parents and young people, linking with larger networks on parental engagement.

## **10 What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?**

10.1 Putting into practice the Every Children in Education Every Day proposals will result in a much more transparent system regarding exclusions and the movement of children between schools across the city. SCC is committed to ensuring that parents and children have a voice via a clear, recognised legal framework. Ending Supported Transfers will ensure that the parents of children accessing the PRU will have had their rightful opportunity to put forward their opinion to the Governors Disciplinary Committee.

The risks and benefits of ending supported transfers is further highlighted in Appendix 2.

10.2 Establishing Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships will ensure that good practice and relevant information is shared freely amongst schools through a robust network. Strengthened partnership working will lead to raising standards across schools through school to school support and the sharing of best practice and innovation.

10.3 Further development of the new Referral Team, which is based at the Sheffield Inclusion Centre will provide a “one stop shop” approach which will support parents in being able to easily access advice and support when needed.

## **11. Recommendations**

11.1 Note and endorse the Every Child in Education Every Day strategic work and its commitment to raising standards across the city by focussing on access to appropriate education for some of its most vulnerable groups of children;

11.2 Comment on the strategy for tackling exclusions and specifically the proposal to end Supported Transfers permanently.

11.3 Support the establishment of the Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships.





## Appendix 1

### Every Child in Education Every Day


#### Key Data on Exclusions and Other Reasons Why Children and Young People May Not Be in School

Data for secondary schools only (with the exception of persistent absence) has been included as the numbers of primary school children, especially for exclusions, are so small and therefore statistically not significant and the other categories do not apply to primary schools.

##### 1. Permanent Exclusions

Permanent Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	0.02 (5)	Statistically insignificant <5	
National	0.15	0.13	
Core Cities	0.21	0.19	
Statistical Neighbours	0.19	0.21	
Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). The percentages are the numbers of pupils as a proportion of the total number of children.			





##### 1.1 Supported Transfers

Supported Transfers	2010-11	2011-12	Trend
Sheffield	0.54 (144)	0.45 (120)	
Source: Sheffield Admissions, full year total, percentage of total pupils (number of pupils).			

Since 2006, Sheffield has operated a policy of 'supported transfer' as an alternative to permanent exclusion. A supported transfer is a brokered placement at the Pupil Referral Unit. The data in the tables above shows that the number of permanent exclusions in Sheffield is negligible, but the number of supported transfers, whilst reducing, is high by comparison with the equivalent measure for permanent exclusions in other authorities.

## 2. Fixed Term Exclusions (Incidents)





### Overall

Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	13.0	9.6	
National	8.6	8.4	
Core Cities	11.2	11.3	
Statistical Neighbours	11.9	10.1	

Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.





The number of pupils with fixed-term exclusions has fallen in Sheffield in the last 2 years and is not slightly lower than our statistical neighbours and closer to the national average. On a more detailed analysis, Sheffield has higher levels of BME exclusions than most other authorities.

### BME

Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	17.6	13.2	
National	8.5	8.2	
Core Cities	11.2	10.5	
Statistical Neighbours	10.1	8.2	


Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.




### White British

Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	11.7	8.4	
National	8.6	8.4	
Core Cities	11.8	12.2	
Statistical Neighbours	12.2	10.4	





Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.

### White and Black Caribbean





Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	25.8	26.7	

National	18.7	18.3	
Core Cities	23.9	11.3	
Statistical Neighbours	24.8	23.7	
Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.			




### Black

Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	23.5	15.4	
National	9.8	12.8	
Core Cities	14.8	14.0	
Statistical Neighbours	10.3	7.7	
Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.			

### Pakistani



Fixed Term Exclusions	2010	2011	Trend
Sheffield	15.6	11.6	
National	9.8	6.5	
Core Cities	8.1	7.1	
Statistical Neighbours	8.0	7.2	
Source: DfE National Indicators, as at January PLASC (the census). This is the number of exclusion incidents as a percentage of the number of children on roll.			

### Fixed Term Exclusions by Gender for Sheffield (% incidents)



Gender	Exam Year 2010	Exam Year 2011	Trend
All Children	14.8	11.7	
Female	8.3	6.8	
Male	21.2	16.4	

### Fixed Term Exclusions by SEN for Sheffield (% incidents)

SEN	Exam Year	Exam Year	Trend
-----	-----------	-----------	-------

	2010	2011	
All Children	14.8	11.7	
Total SEN	30.8	24.0	

### 3. Transfers




Transfers	2010-11	2011-12	Trend
Managed Moves	16	11	
In-Year Transfers, between secondary schools	262	325	
Source: Sheffield Admissions, full year total, number of pupils			

The number of transfers between secondary schools is high in Sheffield. Managed moves are those brokered by the Council where a pupil is at risk of exclusion. Other in-year transfers are those requested on application by a parent. Although we have no comparable figures from other authorities, our view is that the number of in-year transfers between schools is high in Sheffield, and it is rising.

#### 3.1 SWAPPS


There is a process for Sheffield Headteachers to meet in locality groups to broker transfers of young people to a new school as part of a behaviour management strategy. These transfers are undertaken for a trial period, usually 6 weeks. This process is managed by Headteachers and the number of young people trailing places at alternative schools is not recorded centrally.

### 4. Children Missing in Education (CME)




	2010-11	2011-12	Trend
Number of CME cases	2474	2624	
Of which number of newly arrived children or pupils not on a school role	1574	1815	
Fair Access Admissions	62	61	
Source: Sheffield CME team, full year total, number of pupils.			

The increase in the number of referrals to the Children Missing in Education team is mainly due to the rise in newly arrived children during 2011-12. Other cases that the team deals with are 'missing children' who have moved out of Sheffield without leaving details of a new school or address. The key issues with placing newly arrived children are avoiding unnecessary delay and the availability of a school place at a reasonable travel distance. Fair Access is used for hard to place children where the normal process of admission has failed. The number of Fair Access referrals has remained consistent over the two year period.

### 5. Alternative Provision


Alternative Provision	2010-11	2011-12	Trend
Elective Home Education	195	207	



PRU	106	119	
Hospital	787	544	
Attending off-site provision	2653	1908	
Source: Sheffield Inclusion Centre and Extended Curriculum Teams, number of pupils, full year total			

The data in the above table shows a mixed picture. The number of children being educated at home is rising and is now significantly higher than in the past decade where there were typically fewer than 100 such students. The number of children attending off-site provision has also fallen significantly, although this data is only those students on the VSP programme, not in provision arranged directly by the school, for which we do not have figures.

## 6. Persistent Absence

Persistent Absence	Primary	Secondary	Trend
Sheffield 2011/12	4.30	9.00	

Persistent Absence 2010-11	Primary	Secondary
Sheffield	5.10	10.60
National	3.90	8.40
Core Cities	5.65	11.30
Statistical Neighbours	4.24	9.61

Persistent absentees are defined as having an overall absence rate of around 15% or more. This equates to 46 or more sessions of absence (authorised and unauthorised) during the year (half-terms 1-5).

The tables above reports Sheffield's persistent absence for 2010/11 compared to National, Core Cities and Statistical Neighbours. While data is available for Sheffield for 2011/12 it is not yet available for the other areas to enable comparison.

**Primary** – in 2010/11 Sheffield had lower levels of persistent absence than Core Cities but higher than National and Statistical Neighbours. This year (2011/12) there has been a decrease in Primary persistent absence in Sheffield by 0.8%.

**Secondary** – in 2010/11 Sheffield had lower levels of persistent absence than Core Cities but higher than National and Statistical Neighbours. This year (2011/12) there has been a decrease in Secondary persistent absence in Sheffield by 1.6%.

Draft