

Day six of exclusion: the extent and quality of provision for pupils

Schools' and local authorities' discharge of their duties to provide full-time and suitable education from day six of fixed-period and permanent exclusions

Schools and local authorities are required to provide full-time and suitable education for pupils from day six of fixed-period and permanent exclusions. This survey evaluates the extent to which a sample of schools and local authorities were meeting these requirements, the provision they had put in place, and how they ensured that education for excluded pupils was of good quality. The survey also reports on how practice is changing as a result of the statutory requirements that have been in place since September 2007.

Age group: 5–16

Published: May 2009

Reference no: 080255

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects registered childcare and children's social care, including adoption and fostering agencies, residential schools, family centres and homes for children. It also inspects all state-maintained schools, non-association independent schools, pupil referral units, further education, initial teacher education, and publicly funded adult skills and employment-based training, the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (Cafcass), and the overall level of services for children in local authority areas.

If you would like a copy of this report in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 08456 404040, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

Alexandra House
33 Kingsway
London WC2B 6SE

T: 08456 404040
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

No. 080255

© Crown copyright 2009



Contents

Executive summary	4
Key findings	5
Recommendations	6
Meeting the requirements	7
The nature of the provision	10
Quality assurance of provision	13
What has changed?	14
Notes	16
Further information	16
Publications	16
Websites	17
Schools and other providers visited for this survey	17
Primary schools	17
Secondary schools	17
Special schools	18
Pupil referral units	18
Other provision	18
The pilot stage	18

Executive summary

The Education and Inspections Act 2006 required schools to provide, by September 2007, full-time and suitable education from day six of a pupil's fixed-period exclusion. The provision could be located off site or in provision shared with other schools. Local authorities were required to make suitable arrangements for permanently excluded pupils from day six of the exclusion, replacing the expectation that they make provision from day 16.

The survey indicates the extent to which the schools and local authorities visited met the requirements and describes what was done to meet the needs of excluded pupils from day six. Changes in provision had led to a reduction in long-term fixed exclusion in many of the schools surveyed. The small sample size, however, means that generalisations should not be drawn from the findings.

In the autumn term 2008, inspectors visited 28 secondary, five primary and three special schools, 16 pupil referral units (PRUs) and two other types of provision for permanently excluded pupils in 18 local authorities. The major focus of the inspection was on secondary schools, since the largest number of exclusions occur there.

During the academic year 2007/08, the number of incidents of exclusion of six days or more across the 36 survey schools was 128. Five of the secondary schools in the sample had not excluded any pupils for more than six days during the academic year, while one secondary school had used longer-term exclusion 23 times.

Of the 36 schools visited, eight secondary and two special schools were unable to fully meet the requirements for day six provision. The schools that were able to meet them did so in partnership with other schools or the local PRU. Five of the secondary schools and one of the special schools, in an attempt to ensure continuity of learning, arranged for pupils to return to school on day six, attending supervised provision on the main school site. However, this was not shared provision, which is a requirement of the regulations.

Although 16 of the 18 local authorities had identified their PRU as the provision for permanently excluded pupils from day six, in practice eight of them did not meet the requirement. The reason for this was a general lack of capacity in PRUs to provide from day six rather than from the previous day 16.

In 18 of the 28 secondary schools visited, fixed-period exclusions had declined from the time the requirements came into force. In terms of exclusions of six days or more, this decrease was marked in 19 of the secondary schools visited. Two of the schools visited failed to use the statutory review process for pupils with statements of special educational needs, using exclusion inappropriately as a trigger to review pupils' needs and placement.

Key findings

- Eight of the 28 secondary schools and two of the three special schools surveyed did not comply with the requirements to provide suitable and full-time education from day six for pupils on fixed-period exclusions. One special and five secondary schools provided education on their own site but, contrary to the requirements in the regulations, failed to share the arrangements with partnership schools. They felt more able to ensure continuity for pupils' learning if they provided exclusively for their pupils on their own site.
- Seven of the 26 schools that complied with the requirements used PRUs to support pupils; 13 educated them on site or within the partnership. Only a handful of schools used alternative providers and two used local authority provision, such as the youth service.
- All but two of the 18 local authorities identified their own PRU for day six provision for permanently excluded pupils, but eight of them did not provide full-time and suitable provision for all permanently excluded pupils from day six. A lack of capacity in PRUs was the main reason for non-compliance.
- In 18 of the 28 secondary schools, the number of fixed-period exclusions fell between 2006/07 and 2007/08. Notably, exclusions of six days or more fell in 23 of the secondary schools and markedly so in 19 schools. Schools had responded to the day six requirements by deciding not to exclude as many pupils for longer periods. They put greater emphasis on prevention. Managed moves in seven of the schools enabled young people to have a fresh start, reducing the need for formal exclusion.
- Difficulties in contacting parents and the reluctance of some parents to accept responsibility for securing their child's attendance at the PRU or other provision often resulted in a breakdown in arrangements, and non-attendance. Transport difficulties also contributed to non-attendance.
- Of the 26 schools that made provision from day six, 21 monitored pupils' responses to fixed-period exclusion, although only one evaluated the overall effectiveness of day six provision, despite its being in place for over a full academic year.
- Effective guidance was provided by 12 of the 18 local authorities, in addition to guidance published by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). As a result, their schools were able to set up day six provision that supported pupils well. Weak guidance and support were reflected in weak provision and, in one case, a failure to comply with the legal requirements. Two of the authorities were unable to report what their schools were doing for fixed-period excluded pupils from day six.
- Eleven of the local authorities monitored the outcomes for permanently excluded day six pupils effectively and 10 had evaluated, or were in the process of evaluating, the overall effectiveness of such provision.
- In four of the secondary schools and two of the special schools, pupils with statements of special educational needs were excluded for more than five days in

2007/08. Two schools used fixed-period exclusion inappropriately to try to trigger a re-assessment of the pupils' needs and so bypass the statutory review system.

Recommendations

The DCSF should:

- support schools by gathering and disseminating examples of good practice in meeting the day six regulations to suit a range of situations.

Local authorities should:

- take steps to ensure that full-time and suitable provision for all permanently excluded pupils is in place from day six
- monitor and evaluate the outcomes for permanently excluded pupils who have used the provision from day six
- use the information to evaluate the overall effectiveness of their day six provision
- give guidance and training to schools so that they routinely provide achievement data and other relevant information about permanently excluded pupils, in order that PRU and other providers can get off to a swift start in educating them.

Schools should:

- ensure that they meet the current requirements fully by providing full-time education for each excluded pupil from day six
- monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of day six provision and its impact on those who use it
- ensure the receiving placement is given a full picture, including their academic profile of the permanently excluded pupil. This should also include detailed information about the support and development needs of the young person
- follow statutory processes for a review of special educational needs and not use exclusion as a means of triggering reviews.

Ofsted should:

- ensure that it incorporates monitoring and evaluation of provision for permanently excluded pupils into its new inspection of safeguarding and looked after children in children's service areas

Meeting the requirements

1. Not all the schools and local authorities surveyed were complying with the requirements of the Education and Inspections Act (2006). Two of the secondary schools and one of the special schools made no provision, five secondary schools and one special school were not making suitable provision as specified by the guidance, and one of the secondary schools was not providing full-time education.¹
2. Eight of the 18 local authorities visited did not comply fully with the day six requirements. The explanation most commonly offered was a lack of capacity in the PRUs, despite the fact that the DCSF had issued guidance to local authorities identifying that capacity in PRUs might need their attention:

‘It is possible that whilst PRUs may have sufficient capacity to cope with the existing day 16 commitment they will find meeting the day six requirement more problematic in terms of capacity.’²

In one PRU visited, a lack of capacity meant that pupils attended for half-day sessions only. In another, a rise in permanent exclusions surprised the local authority, overwhelmed the PRU and resulted in most of the permanently excluded pupils not having access to day six provision.

3. There were delays before pupils could start in their day six provision: in some cases just a day; in others, much longer. In two of the local authorities visited, a very small number of pupils could not take up the provision at day six because communication from the school to the local authority was poor; this resulted in delays in making the necessary arrangements. In one local authority, difficulties in arranging transport at short notice prevented the young person taking up the placement.
4. Transport difficulties affected attendance particularly, although not exclusively, in rural areas. Seven of the schools visited preferred to keep their excluded pupils on their own site rather than to risk their non-attendance at a centre away from their school or home. Four of the secondary schools chose not to exclude pupils beyond five days, in part because of potential difficulties with transport.
5. Five of the secondary schools and one of the special schools arranged education on their own site for the excluded pupils but failed to make

¹ *Providing full-time education from the sixth day of any fixed-period exclusion: implementation and good practice guidance for schools, including PRUs*, DCSF, 2007. This is now subsumed into guidance on exclusion published by the DCSF.

² *Providing full-time education from the sixth day of any fixed-period exclusion: implementation and good practice guidance for local authorities*, DCSF, 2007. This is now subsumed into guidance on exclusion published by the DCSF.

arrangements in partnership with other schools as the legislation requires.³ All were clear that the pupils' misdemeanours warranted exclusions of more than five days but they did not want the exclusion to impede pupils' learning, so they arranged for the pupil to return to school on the sixth day of the exclusion. With one exception, all these schools provided for the pupils' needs within their own on-site units for vulnerable or troublesome pupils. In one of the schools, the deputy headteacher taught the pupils separately from their peers. These schools felt they were able to maintain continuity of learning because subject teachers continued to provide work and to visit the pupils while they were in the unit. Using supervisory staff who were known to the pupils also helped to maintain relationships, expectations and continuity; the schools argued that this was easier to do than if the pupils were off site in another school's provision. Two of the schools also felt that this helped to maintain regular attendance. Four of these five secondary schools were able to demonstrate how the exclusions had helped to improve the behaviour and attitudes of the pupils involved.

6. Two of the schools visited reported that they had excluded pupils for five days but then further emphasised the severity of the misdemeanour by excluding the pupils within their own provision for a further few days on their return to school. They found that this was highly effective in helping to change pupils' attitudes while also providing continuity for their learning. This approach was not in breach of the statutory requirements.

A headteacher argued that providing full-time education for the two pupils excluded in the last year with fixed-period exclusions of more than five days could not be achieved by making them travel to the nearest maintained secondary school, some 26 miles away, especially if continuity and progression were important. He felt he was able to achieve this by ensuring that, from day six, the two pupils attended the Supervised Learning Unit, on the school's own site, to work through the remaining days of their exclusion and to follow their timetable there as well as possible.

A parent agreed with this judgement. She was of the opinion that having to travel to the nearest equivalent school would have compromised progression in her son's learning. She suggested that it was unlikely that he would have attended because of the difficulties in travelling there and

³ The Education and Inspections Act 2006 section 100(3):

(3) The education must not be provided at the school unless it is provided there in pursuance of arrangements which:

(a) are made jointly with the governing body of at least one other relevant school, and
 (b) make provision for the education of pupils excluded on disciplinary grounds from any of the schools that are parties to the arrangements.

back each day. She appreciated the headteacher's efforts in limiting the impact of the exclusions on her son's learning.

'The seclusion unit keeps you in education. If you are sent home and work is sent there you are less likely to do it than you are in school. If you are at home you will "carry on" more with your Mam than you would with teachers.' (Year 11 pupil who returned to his own school at day six for the rest of his exclusion.)

7. In 13 examples of day six provision, some excluded pupils were allowed to attend before day six and, in some instances, from day one. This was mainly for children who were looked after, although schools extended this to other vulnerable pupils. One small local authority made provision from day one for all permanently excluded pupils.
8. In 22 of the schools visited, pupils' attendance at day six provision was good. However, in the other schools visited for the survey, attendance was unsatisfactory. The main reasons pupils failed to attend were:
 - difficulties that schools encountered in communicating with parents
 - parents who were not prepared to accept the exclusion or work with the schools.

Similar reasons account for the poor attendance and non-attendance of pupils who are permanently excluded.

One local authority discovered that some parents were refusing to send their children to the PRU because of the stigma associated with it. This led the local authority and the PRU to change the provision for day six pupils. It became physically separate from the PRU and was known as an 'assessment centre', although it was still managed by the PRU. The number of pupils refusing to attend fell. In addition, more pupils returned to mainstream schools from the assessment centre than had done so from the PRU itself.

9. All the schools in the survey recognised their responsibility to accommodate excluded pupils. However, the levels of support and guidance received from local authorities varied. They influenced both the organisation and quality of the curriculum that was provided. Twelve of the 18 local authorities gave schools helpful guidance and support to establish their provision. During the survey, headteachers were keen to express to inspectors their appreciation of the training that had been provided for them and their governors. In 13 of the schools visited, the headteachers said they felt more confident in working with their partner schools to establish shared provision, using the guidance from the DCSF. Seven of the local authorities helped schools by making provision in their PRUs for pupils with fixed-period exclusions. However, two of the authorities visited were unable to identify what each of their schools had put in place to meet the needs of excluded pupils.

The nature of the provision

10. Of the schools visited, 20 secondary, five primary and one special school had made arrangements that complied with the DCSF requirements. Shared arrangements had been established by 13 schools through local school partnerships. A further seven schools used the local authority's PRU, four used other providers and two used local authority provision such as the youth service.
11. Schools were more likely to use shared provision with other schools when good partnerships had been established and they were sufficiently close to avoid travel difficulties. Arranging shared provision was more of a challenge for special schools because a pupil's individual needs, as set out in the statement of special educational needs, could not necessarily be met in another school. Schools choosing to use a PRU did so because they had confidence in the quality of the provision and when distances between schools made other arrangements impractical. Other providers, used by four schools, included the Connexions service, the local college and alternative vocational provision known by the school to be effective in supporting young people.
12. All the schools in the survey were able to say how they had changed their practices to reduce the need for exclusion. Of those visited 22 had reviewed their pastoral arrangements. However, eight of the schools emphasised that they had not adjusted their practices in direct response to the requirements but as part of a more general review of provision to promote better behaviour and attendance. Regardless of the reasons, preventative work had contributed to reducing longer fixed-period exclusions.
13. The number of longer-term exclusions in the few primary schools and special schools visited was very low and it was therefore not possible to discern trends. However, in 23 of the 28 secondary schools visited, the number of fixed-period exclusions of six days or more had fallen between 2006/07 and 2007/08.

The actions most commonly taken by secondary schools included:

- establishing internal exclusion rooms, sometimes referred to as a 'seclusion' or 'time out' room
- revising policies and practices in relation to behaviour
- developing greater multi-agency involvement – four of the schools noted the Common Assessment Framework as significant in this respect
- organising training for staff in managing behaviour
- widening the range of support workers employed by or involved with the school, including youth workers, learning mentors, social workers, education welfare officers, independent counsellors and family support workers

- involving non-teaching staff more in pastoral care and releasing teachers to focus on raising standards
- reviewing curriculum opportunities in order to provide better support for those at risk of disaffection
- increasing governors' involvement at a case level: one of the schools held a hearing with governors for pupils who reached 'red' on the traffic lights in its behaviour policy.

14. Good examples of such policies in action are illustrated below.

To help prevent exclusion, a school used an on-site centre for those at risk of exclusion. This was staffed by two workers seconded from the local authority's provision for excluded Key Stage 4 students and two of the school's teaching assistants. The centre was run in partnership with a neighbouring school.

Pupils generally spent between six and 12 weeks at the centre. They had a phased reintroduction to mainstream school when they were ready, either to this school or through a managed move to a partner school. The headteacher explained that the centre was used in cases where, in the past, they would have used longer fixed-period exclusions. He felt there was no need for day six provision, since the school could now respond in this way.

In describing a feature of the school's improved preventative work, a headteacher noted that the engagement of other agencies since establishing the school's inclusion panel had been effective. He said, 'Agencies have to report back to the inclusion panel and this encourages their full engagement.'

15. Seven of the secondary schools visited identified 'managed moves' and 'fair access policies' as contributory factors in reducing fixed-period exclusions of six days or more. Managed moves and fair access policies are agreements between schools to make sure that they continue to educate pupils at risk of permanent exclusion. These had been used to reduce pressure on the schools concerned and to give pupils who were close to permanent exclusion an opportunity for a fresh start in another school.
16. Sixteen of the 18 local authorities placed permanently excluded pupils in PRUs. The reasons for this were largely historical: since the PRUs were already established, admission arrangements needed little adjustment. One local authority provided e-learning at home; another used a base at a college of further education for more vocationally oriented pupils and commissioned teaching from an independent provider for those wanting a more academic group of subjects.

17. One large local authority assigned all its permanently excluded pupils to a virtual classroom. It created a six-week programme for them, with the aim of reintegrating them into mainstream schools. The virtual classroom consisted of between four and six pupils, working on laptops at home and following lessons with clear learning objectives. Pupils understood the criteria by which their work would be assessed. For security reasons, pupils did not share their names with others and the teacher controlled the screens from the PRU's office.
18. However, this same local authority was unable to make suitable full-time provision for all pupils from day six in the first year of operation, because difficulties in contacting parents caused significant delays. Indeed, only 70% of the pupils had access to full-time provision by day 10. There was also an increase in demand, which led to delays in providing pupils with laptops. Attendance, as measured by the uptake of lessons, was therefore very low at around 50%. These early difficulties were overcome, but this method of working was not suitable for all pupils. It was found that some with learning difficulties and/or disabilities were not suited to working solely on a computer screen without adult support and they were quickly moved to more appropriate provision. Some working parents were also reluctant to accept virtual learning as they did not wish to leave their child unsupervised at home. They were entitled to do this as the responsibility for a pupil in post-exclusion provision rests with the referring local authority or school rather than the child's parents.
19. Twenty-three of the 26 schools that complied with the requirements developed protocols between themselves and the related provision so that each understood its particular role and responsibilities. Communication between the partners was effective in 29 cases, including the six schools that provided solely on their own sites for pupils excluded for six days or more. In all but two secondary schools, one primary and one special school, the letters sent to parents about the exclusion followed the guidance provided by the DCSF and included appropriate reference to provision from day six of exclusion.
20. In five of the seven instances where local authorities used provision at a PRU for pupils from day six of a fixed-period exclusion, the curriculum was different from that for pupils who were excluded permanently. There was a strong emphasis on pupils following the curriculum they would meet on returning to the mainstream school. Individual work was provided and they were taught separately from others, sometimes by a teacher or teaching assistant from their own school. In one case, however, pupils were integrated into the existing classes; in another, a pupil with special educational needs was placed in an assessment centre managed by the PRU.
21. In all but five of the secondary schools visited, partnership arrangements for fixed-period exclusions included clear protocols about transferring information about pupils. All the schools complying with the day six requirement found that

they were in a stronger position to get off to a swift start and create a curriculum better suited to a pupil's needs.

22. However, for the PRUs in the survey, receiving permanently excluded pupils was by no means as positive an experience. Even taking into account that information about some pupils was sparse because of a history of poor attendance, 10 of the 16 PRUs told inspectors that they did not receive information about the day six pupils that was either sufficient or timely enough to help them start a planned learning programme. Four of the PRUs had to request information frequently and this was not forthcoming once the pupil was out of the school. One PRU found that gaining information from another local authority was virtually impossible. The PRU, which provided learning through a virtual classroom, reported receiving incomplete assessment information about some pupils, which made managing a virtual classroom particularly difficult.
23. The use of the funding from the DCSF to establish provision for day six excluded pupils was particularly variable. In two of the local authorities, officers responsible for the day six provision were unsure how the grant had been used. The other local authorities had made a variety of arrangements including:
 - retaining the funding so that it could be used to support schools and LA services as and when day six provision developed
 - allocating funding between PRUs
 - allocating funding to schools or clusters of schools to develop their own provision.

Sixteen of the 36 schools surveyed said they had no knowledge of how the local authority had used the grant.

Quality assurance of provision

24. Of the schools using day six provision for fixed-period exclusions, 21 of them monitored pupils' attendance and behaviour. However, only one had undertaken a detailed evaluation of the effectiveness of the provision and its impact on improvements in learning and behaviour.
25. Part of the reason for the slow action on monitoring was that schools had so few pupils placed in the provision and felt it either unnecessary or too early to evaluate it. Nevertheless, evaluating what is working in terms of changing pupils' attitudes and behaviour, even if the evidence is slim, is important for planning provision for the future. Schools accommodating pupils on site invariably used existing arrangements for quality assurance to ensure that the provision was benefiting individual pupils.
26. All the local authorities visited analysed exclusions data effectively. Eleven of them monitored effectively the outcomes for permanently excluded pupils attending PRUs and alternative providers. Two of the authorities established

successful long-term monitoring procedures for pupils returning to mainstream school, as part of a fair access protocol. Ten had evaluated, or were in the process of evaluating, the overall effectiveness of their day six provision.

27. Pupils were well supported when returning to school because of the detailed monitoring that took place, building on the reintegration interviews following their exclusion. All the schools visited agreed clear targets with their returning pupils. In most cases, the return to mainstream learning included:
- the identification of additional support, involving small group or individual work, often within the school's own inclusion centre
 - personalised programmes of work
 - adaptations to the timetable and curriculum
 - support, counselling and mentoring for the pupil from a named adult.

The pupils appreciated the support that they received, especially where they recognised the changes were there to help them avoid further exclusion.

‘My head of year asks what’s wrong with the school and he fixes everything. He’s like Bob the Builder.’ (Year 8 pupil who spent days six and seven of exclusion in the school’s own unit.)

What has changed?

28. In the secondary schools surveyed, incidents of fixed-period exclusion of more than five days fell from 461 to 112 between the academic years 2006/07 and 2007/08; they fell in 23 of the 28 secondary schools surveyed, in 19 of these by 50% or more.
29. Fixed-period exclusions, regardless of length, fell only marginally from 3,788 in 2006/07 to 3,680 in 2007/08 in the secondary schools surveyed. Fixed-period exclusions fell in 18 of the 28 secondary schools.
30. There is no clear evidence to suggest that the use of fixed-period exclusion for more than five days and its reduction over time has increased permanent exclusions. Between 2006/07 and 2007/08, permanent exclusions rose in eight of the local authorities visited and decreased in eight. Exclusions in one remained static and the remaining local authority had no data available.
31. Schools used a range of criteria to judge if the provision had made a positive contribution to pupils’ outcomes. Some felt simply that retaining pupils through to the end of their schooling was a measure of success. Others felt that managed moves or placements in alternative education settings were also signs of success.

32. Of the schools surveyed, 21 reported a positive impact of exclusion on outcomes for pupils' behaviour and, in some cases, their attainment. However, in seven of the schools, there was little impact, as evidenced by continued fixed-period exclusions or permanent exclusion. In the remaining eight schools, either there were no exclusions of five days or more, or pupils moved out of the area at the time of the exclusion and could not be tracked.
33. The one school that undertook a detailed evaluation of the effectiveness of the day six provision was able to demonstrate an improvement in the attendance, attainment, behaviour and progress of those who had been excluded and supported on re-entry. It was able to show increases in attainment in both Key Stage 3 and 4 national tests and examination results.
34. It is difficult to determine whether it was the exclusion or the subsequent support that resulted in improvements. However, for some pupils, exclusion as a punishment was successful, since it challenged their behaviour, acted as a warning to which they responded, and quickly helped them get back on track. A few parents and pupils reported that having to attend another school after day six of their exclusion was a shock and made the pupils realise that they wanted to stay at their own school. Even pupils who, contrary to regulations, returned to serve their exclusion in their own school said the jolt of the exclusion, separation from friends and the stigma of seclusion helped them take stock, as the pupils and parents attest:

'It was a shock to his system. He had no friends there and doesn't want to go back. He has had the odd detention since then but no further exclusions. He is a changed boy and he has really knuckled down.' (Parent of boy in Year 9, excluded for 10 days for physical assault, who attended provision in a partner school.)

'You don't want to go back there. It makes you realise you could get kicked out of school. The reintegration meeting makes you realise how much you've messed up. It takes courage to face up to what you've done in front of your parent.' (Year 11 pupil excluded for 10 days for disruptive behaviour who attended provision in a partner school.)

'The exclusion gave her a shock as she didn't want to be there. She was completely changed when she got back to class, was less volatile and more focused. Her relationship with her peers much improved.' (Parent of a Year 11 pupil.)

Another pupil interviewed said the unit made him really think about what he'd done. He lost his entitlements and couldn't be with his friends. He described it as a mixture of 'shock and boredom'. He was helped to catch up with work he needed to do. His parents were required to bring him and sign him in and collect him and sign him out each day. They had a very positive view of the experience because 'he's only had a few blips since'.

35. There were occasions, however, when schools used exclusion inappropriately as an alternative to, or a trigger for, statutory statementing processes for pupils with special educational needs. In 2007/08, four of the secondary schools and two of the special schools surveyed excluded pupils with statements of special educational needs for fixed periods of six days or more. In two cases, the exclusions were used inappropriately to try to trigger reassessments of the pupils' needs and so to bypass the statutory review system. This potentially limited the statutory rights of the child and the parents. In one of the primary schools, the exclusion was used to trigger a statutory assessment. The headteacher of one of these schools, who lacked confidence in the local authority's application of the statutory assessment process, said:

'Without the exclusion the pupil wouldn't have got into the special school. We had to create some momentum to persuade everyone.'

Notes

The survey was undertaken in the autumn term 2008. Inspectors visited 28 secondary schools, five primary schools and three special schools in 18 local authorities. Inspectors also visited 16 PRUs and two other types of local authority provision for permanently excluded pupils. The sample had a strong secondary bias since the majority of exclusions of six days or more are made by secondary schools. The sample reflected the range of types of local authority and school settings, to include large and small schools as well as urban and rural locations. During the academic year 2007/08, 128 pupils had been excluded from the sample schools for six days or more. Six schools had excluded no pupils and one had made 23 exclusions of more than six days.

During the visits, inspectors held discussions with local authority representatives, headteachers, other senior managers, staff, parents, carers and pupils. Lessons were observed and documents scrutinised. Schools and local authorities provided data for inspectors about exclusions.

Further information

Publications

Providing full-time education from the sixth day of any fixed-period exclusion: implementation and good practice guidance for schools, including PRUs, DCSF, 2007.

Providing full-time education from the sixth day of any fixed-period exclusion: implementation and good practice guidance for local authorities, DCSF, 2007.

Both of the above guidance documents have now been subsumed by the 2008 exclusions guidance published by the DCSF, which is available at: <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/behaviour/exclusion/2008guidance/>.

Pupil referral units: establishing successful practice in pupil referral units and local authorities (070019), Ofsted, 2007; <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/070019>.

Websites

The Department for Children, Schools and Families: exclusions and alternative provision; <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/exclusions/>.

Frequently asked questions about exclusions;
<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/exclusions/faq/index.cfm>.

Schools and other providers visited for this survey

Primary schools

Brocklewood Junior School	Nottingham
Elliston Junior School, Cleethorpes	North East Lincolnshire
Goldenhill Primary School	Stoke-on-Trent
St Teresa's Catholic Junior School	Liverpool
Tiverton Primary School	Haringey

Secondary schools

Beacon Hill Community School, Wigton	Cumbria
Beacon Hill High School Business and Enterprise College	Blackpool
Bishop Ullathorne Catholic School	Coventry
Bispham High School – An Arts College	Blackpool
Blake Valley Technology College, Cannock	Staffordshire
Brownhills Maths and Computing College	Stoke-on-Trent
Churchfields School	Swindon
Chasetown Specialist Sports College, Burntwood	Staffordshire
Crispin School, Street	Somerset
Durham Community Business College	Durham
Elliott Durham School	Nottingham
Graveney School	Wandsworth
Hamble Community Sports College, Southampton	Hampshire
Heathcote School	Waltham Forest
Highworth Warneford School	Swindon
Levenshulme High School	Manchester
Leytonstone Business & Enterprise Specialist School	Waltham Forest
Netherhall School, Maryport	Cumbria
Newall Green High School	Manchester
Princes Risborough School	Buckinghamshire
Quilley School of Engineering, Eastleigh	Hampshire
Salesian College	Wandsworth
Sedgefield Community College – a Specialist Sports College	Durham
Sir Christopher Hatton School, Wellingborough	Northamptonshire
St Thomas More Catholic School	Haringey
The Cottesloe School, Leighton Buzzard	Buckinghamshire

The Kings of Wessex School, Cheddar
Weston Favell School

Somerset
Northamptonshire

Special schools

Bank View High School
Cambridge Park Maths and Computing College, Grimsby
Woodfield

Liverpool
North East Lincolnshire
Coventry

Pupil referral units

Aylesbury Vale Secondary Support Centre
Broom Cottages
Complementary Education
KS4 PRU
Denewood Pupil Referral Unit
Gillford Centre, Carlisle
Quayside Education Centre, Gosport
Reach
Secondary Centre
Stafford Teaching Unit at The Stables
Stratton Education Centre
Alternative Provision Service, Taunton
CHASE Extended Learning Centre
Francis Barber Pupil Referral Unit
Educational Diversity
Haringey Pupil Referral Unit

Buckinghamshire
Durham
Northamptonshire
Manchester
Nottingham
Cumbria
Hampshire
Stoke-on-Trent
Liverpool
Staffordshire
Swindon
Somerset
Coventry
Wandsworth
Blackpool
Haringey

Other provision

New Start
Study Support, Grimsby
CHANCES, Nunsthorpe

Waltham Forest
North East Lincolnshire
North East Lincolnshire

The pilot stage

The following helped to trial the survey materials:

The Elton High School Specialist Arts College
Broad Oak High School
Castlebrook High School
New Summerseat House
St Helens local authority
Wirral local authority

Bury
Bury
Bury
Bury