Send your Recognition Project to your Regional Centre (details at [www.tla.ac.uk](http://www.tla.ac.uk) under ‘TLA in Your Region’).

Personal details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Your name: | Becki Coombe | School/College/Institution/ Organisation name: | Newman University |
| Contact e-mail: | becki.coombe@thelearn2group.org.uk | School/College/Institution/ Organisation address: | Genners Lane, Birmingham |

Recognition 2 Writing Frame

**Section 1- Preparing for the Learning Journey**

|  |
| --- |
| **1.1 Briefly describe your working context**  In 2007, I founded my organisation, Learn2 to deliver alternative curricula programmes within schools after I had become frustrated by experiences I had repeatedly witnessed within local secondary schools. I formed an opinion that learners classified as at ‘high risk of becoming NEET’ (not in education, employment or training), were often sent to sit/wait in corridors for senior members of staff and excluded from classroom learning experiences; generally due to continual low levels of disruptive behaviour. It was (and still is) my belief, that with the optimum caring and a structured learning environment, disaffected and disengaged learners are able to thrive within (adapted) classroom environments, in-turn enhancing the quality of their provision and improving learner attitudes. The OECD (2015, p.373) placed great emphasis that the “length and **quality** of the schooling that individuals receive has an impact on student’s transition from school to work”. Norman (2011, p.17) documented “improving attendance and **attitudes** to school” as one of the strategies that schools may implement in order to improve numbers of learners achieving 5x A\*-C academic grades.  In 2012, I self-funded and opened The LEC, Learn2 Education Centre, for learners aged 14-16 (Key Stage 4) to attend 0.5/1 day per week provision, in small group sizes. The LEC was successful in recruiting Year 10 and 11 learners from local secondary schools and the county referral unit from its first day of opening. I was very conscious that I wanted the provision to be taken seriously in the eyes of the schools and not to be seen as some sort of youth activity base, so, I ensured that The LEC was operated similarly to a school. To this end, I ensured that all staff held formal teaching qualifications.  The Learn2 Education Centre (LEC) is an educational charity with one objective; *To advance education for the public benefit for disaffected, disengaged and/or vulnerable young people and adults*. As part of the provision, a maximum of six learners may attend one day per week to complete sessions in Functional Skills English and Maths, PSHE (Year 9) or Employability (Year 10/11) related units. I feel that developing my teaching and learning at Masters level has empowered me to use national policy and tools to provide further opportunities for my learners, in addition to enabling me to maintain academic currency whilst I work outside of mainstream provision. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.2 Access to coaching and mentoring**  I work within a small and specialised learning environment. I have peers that are experienced working with disaffected and disengaged learners, as well as those with identified special educational needs. In November 2012, Ealing categorised individuals at a more significant risk of becoming NEET according the following data:   * White girls who received free school meals (FSM) * Persistent absences in Year 5 * Looked after child in care (LAC) * FSM and special educational needs (SEN) statement * Fixed or permanent exclusion during primary school   Alongside the provided data, Ealing (November 2012) clearly stated, “*this is just intended as a starting point to help schools identify who might be at risk. There may well be students on the list who are not at risk and students who the school knows are at risk who are not identified”.* Ealing recommended that schools add to the initial list of indicators, suggesting they may consider additional characteristics such as:   * Key Stage 2 (KS2) attainment * Key Stage 4 (KS4) attainment * Exclusion * Attendance * Known to the Youth Offending Team * Known to Social Services * Housing Issues   I have strong working links with referral school teaching and senior leadership staff, including the local extended learning centres. However, I do not work with, or know anyone who is an experienced or qualified Nurture Group practitioner.  I plan therefore, to attend and complete an accredited ‘Nurture Group’ practitioner course delivered in two parts. The second part follows a period of time in which I can apply learned principles complete a case study(s) and access any required support from ‘Nurture Groups’ personnel. Post course completion, I will have access to the ‘Nurture Groups Network’ online and CPD event resources.  I have recently completed my National Professional Qualification in Headship and therefore have access to external National College of Teaching and Leadership resources as well as gauging professional opinions of colleagues met on the course.  Finally, I am attending Newman University completing a Masters in Education and as such, have access to electronic academic resources and the ability to converse with a range of academic professionals. As a student and professional within the Teaching and Learning Academy I will be allocated a personal tutor experienced in encouraging critical thinking and providing alternative perspectives. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.3 What is the focus for your learning**  I aim to demonstrate that disaffected and/or disengaged Key Stage 4 learners that do not fully meet ‘Nurture Groups’ assessment baselines, academically and socially benefit from a formal ‘Nurture Group’ provision equally to learners that fully meet assessment criteria. I intend to present my findings with an aim to modernise ‘Nurture Groups’ principles and make them fully inclusive to the needs of my learners.  I designed and opened The LEC prior to having any awareness of the widely accepted term ‘nurture groups’. Nurture groups being a concept developed at the end of the 1960s in East London (UK) by a school psychologist, Marjorie Boxall and her team. Boxall (2002) cited by Couture (2012, p.265) reported that as early as the 1960s, many violent, aggressive and disruptive children were referred to clinics and several children were excluded from school a few weeks after their entry. To this end, I am surprised in the fifty years of growth and development of formal nurture provision such as accredited nurture groups (Nurture Group Network), that recognised and formalised nurture group provisions appear to be most prevalent in primary schools and smaller special educational needs (SEN) provisions within secondary schools, as opposed to within referral and exclusion provisions, such as is the main referral pathway of learners accessing The LEC.  In 2011, Ofsted completed a survey of 29 infant, first and primary schools, examining the use of nurture groups. The only referenced sources related to the term ‘nurture group’ were Marjorie Boxall and the Nurture Group Network. Ofsted (2011), described how the surveyed schools “sought to provide a safe, comfortable, home-like environment, with clear routines and adults modelling positive relationships, in line with nurture group principles”. Ofsted reported that sometimes the pupils who were selected for the groups had been previously excluded from school on a fixed-term basis, were in danger of permanent exclusion, or were being considered for a move to special school. Without nurture group intervention, it could be hypothesised that learners may have further disengaged, or completely removed themselves from the education system.  Furnace (2014, p3), described how Boxall drew on the principles of attachment theory when developing the nurture group approach. Furnace further described how according to Bowlby (1969), difficult behaviour in school was the result of poor or faulty attachments. Bowlby, who pioneered attachment theory in 1969, attributed a poor childhood connectivity (such as not being nursed when crying) to being a key affecter of the child’s relationships in later life. Boxall (2002) cited by Furnace (2014, p4) outlined “the primary function of a nurture group therefore, as to create the opportunity for children who have missed out on these crucial early experiences to ‘start again’, be nurtured and re-experience early attachment in school”.  As an advancement to attachment theories, Colley (2011, p4) evaluated a *range* of developmental theories in a bid to understand the concepts associated with nurture group intervention. Marjorie Boxall, a pivotal figure in founding the diagnostic tool, the Boxall Profile and documented in numerous sources as founding and developing nurture groups, associated closely with attachment theory. Colley further commented on social cognitive theory and on the works of Piaget, Vygotsky and Maslow, whom, he claimed “approached childhood understanding as part of a development process rather than focusing on needs of students with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties”. Whilst I recognise many aspects of both attachment and development theories, I maintain my original perspective of founding The LEC, that should each stage of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs be enabled, our disaffected and disengaged learners will progress academically, developmentally and socially. This was alluded to by Copper and Whitbread (2007) and Kearney (2005), cited by Colley (2011) who both stated that Maslow’s (1954) theory related to human motivation influenced nurture group practice. Maslow formulated five hierarchical levels of basic human needs, with each prior stage being required to be completed before progress could be made; physiological (biological needs for oxygen/food/water/body temperature), safety (feeling safe and secure), social (love, affection, belonging), esteem (self-esteem, self respect and both from others), self-actualisation (feeling they have ‘made it’).  I therefore aim to follow Nurture Group principles to assess, plan interventions, deliver and re-assess an anonymous LEC learner to demonstrate that disaffected/disengaged learners academically and socially benefit from following ‘Nurture Group’ principles. In turn, I aim to present my findings to ‘Nurture Groups’ in a bid for them to modernise their principles and make them fully inclusive to the needs of disaffected and disengaged Key Stage 4 learners. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.4 Analyse in what way your learning focus is relevant to your learners, directly or indirectly?**  I believe that learners that typically attend The LEC often have the social and academic abilities and personal desire to be successfully re-integrated into a mainstream academic environment in time for them to complete their Key Stage 4 education. However, our learners regularly continue to disengage in formal learning within their extended learning centre and as a consequence, are not permitted to re-join mainstream educational settings.  I believe that delivering English and Maths lessons within The LEC following ‘Nurture Group’ principles, will aid in refocusing and remodelling our learners’ academic and social behaviours to those that would be deemed appropriate for a school environment. However, in order for provision to meet ‘Nurture Group’ criterions, learners should meet a set of standardised criteria, of which disaffected and disengaged Key Stage 4 learners conform to less, as they may not have attachment issues or identified special educational needs.  Therefore, I wish to explore if assessing learners and applying positive interventions as prescribed by ‘Nurture Groups’ benefit disaffected and disengaged learners similarly to those that reflect to the traditional assessment outcomes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.5 What do you hope will change as a result?**  Should my learning show that disaffected and disengaged Key Stage 4 learners benefit similarly to learners that reflect traditional ‘Nurture Groups’ assessment outcomes and interventions, I aim to present a case for revised assessments and intervention recommendations that are more bespoke in meeting the needs of my learners. In addition, I aim for The LEC to be approved as an accredited ‘Nurture Group’ in order to provide learning in a formal nurture setting. This is currently not possible as my learners are typically not deemed to fulfil ‘Nurture Group’ assessment criteria as being likely to benefit from learning within a formal ‘Nurture Group’. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.6 What ethical considerations/issues have you identified?**  There will be no distinction between selected learners within this study, criteria for engagement relies on a school referring a young person exhibiting social, emotional and/or behavioural challenges; regardless of ethnicity or gender. Historically, The LEC has been referred a ratio of 4:3 male to female learners from the full range of Coventry schools. The LEC is bound by Coventry City Council ‘Work Related Learning’ policies that mandate that “all staff are expected to be committed to social inclusion and familiar with the principles of inclusion and equality of opportunity … to liaise with the student” (Equality and Diversity Policy, 2016)  Highly personal and subjective information is documented in ‘Nurture Groups’ assessment. In additional to schools granting permission for such assessments to be completed, they may wish for Parent/Carers to give permission for assessments and interventions to take place. Schools and Parent/Carers may wish to specify who has access to the information and where results and interpretations are documented, stored and publicised. Whilst The LEC assumes a ‘Duty of Care’ whilst a learner is in our provision, as school-attenders, each learners’ information remains the property of the school and we are bound by national data protection and safeguarding legislations.  Assessment information should be anonymous for safeguarding and data protection purposes, however the young person should also be made aware of the information gathered and intended interventions.  Information should only be collated and seen on a competent and ‘need to know’ basis, by professionals involved in the assessments and interventions. As an academic submission, the study is bound by the Newman University Code of Practice for Research.  This study will be carried out inline with guidance published by the British Educational Research Association (2011). |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.7 What diversity/equal opportunities have you identified in relation to e.g. gender, ethnicity, language, disability and SEND or G&T?**  This learning focus is fully inclusive in terms of it being accessible to any learner that is attending our alternative provision. This means that the learner attends The LEC in place of their extended learning centre placement for one or more days per week. Learners at The LEC typically display disaffected/disengaged behaviours, however they may or may not have identified special educational needs and/or disabilities, be classified as ‘gifted and talented’ in any areas, or have English as their first language.  In my experience, learners may exhibit behaviours that reflect them living with ‘Special Educational Needs or Disabilities’ (SEND), however they may not have been formally assessed within their home or learning environment and therefore not receive a ‘diagnosis’ or ‘classification’ stating they have a specific SEND. I therefore intend to make opportunities and processes available and identical for all learners and their associated stakeholders (e.g. schools/parents/carers). This may include initial discussions, explanations of assessments, how assessments are completed, interpretation and sharing of outcomes. |

**Section 2 Creating a Plan for your Learning Journey**

**Please confirm your intended learning and change focus here:**

|  |
| --- |
| I aim to investigate whether disaffected and/or disengaged Key Stage 4 learners that do not fully meet ‘Nurture Groups’ assessment baselines, academically and socially benefit from a formal ‘Nurture Group’ provision equally to learners that fully meet assessment criteria. |

**Action Plan: What are you going to do to ensure that you meet your learning objectives?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Dates** | **Resources** | **Success Criteria** | **Comments/Amendments** |
| Attend Nurture Group practitioner course 1/2 | 9/2/16 | Nurture Groups Network CPD course booking, Tutor and course resources | Attend full course and fully participate | Ensure fully understand case study assignment and take resources to enable completion |
| Complete a learner pen portrait | Sept 16  - when learner starts course | Follow Nurture Groups course recommendations | Document that meets the criteria, anonymously | Example proforma provided on Nurture Groups course |
| Complete a conduct and emotional behaviour learner observation | Observation proformas, or, resource as selected as preferred following research | Selection and completion of two observations that provide meaningful, quantifiable data to support analysis of learner behaviour | Research observation format to best suit needs (no prescribed observation proforma from Nurture Groups) |
| Complete a learning and emotional behaviour learner observation |
| Complete a learner initial Boxall Profile | *The Theory and Practice of Nurture Groups*  *Beyond the Boxall Profile for Young People. Strategies and Resources* | Fully complete Boxall Profile | Moved to after Oct half term so learner ‘settled in’ to provision over ½ a term |
| Agree a learner action plan | Oct 16 | Agreement within delivery team, approval from school, willingness and understanding by learner | Fully complete ‘SMART’ action plan | Completed early Nov 16 (as per above) |
| Carry out planned intervention(s) | After Oct ½ term | Learner to attend, delivery team to competently perform and deliver interventions/strategies | Carrying out of all interventions, in the prescribed manner, throughout the identified periods | Continued as per above, from first week (Nov 16) after ½ term break |
| Complete post-intervention Boxall Profile | Nov 16 | *The Theory and Practice of Nurture Groups*  *Beyond the Boxall Profile for Young People. Strategies and Resources* | Fully complete Boxall Profile | Date needed moving to enable 9 delivery (intervention) days and completion of analysis.  New date: March 2017 (academic Easter holidays) |
| Present perceived impact of intervention & recommendations for re-integration | Nov 16 | Literature to reference potential effective interventions and ways to interpret analyses | Research how to analyse Boxal Profiles and how to interpret performance indicators |
| Attend Nurture Group practitioner course 2/2,submit | 8/12/16 | Nurture Groups Network CPD Tutor and completed case study assignment | Tutor awards practitioner status and approves assignment | (Complete any prescribed action points as required) |

**Section 3 On the Learning Journey**

At this point refer back to your plan with its key dates and actions and consider your progress.

|  |
| --- |
| **3.1 What has been the influence engaging with the knowledge base?**  Attending the Nurture Group Practitioner course provided a foundation for improving my knowledge and understanding of nurture provision, however more so it introduced me to how to formally assess a learner’s need and likelihood to respond to formal nurture provision by using and interpreting the ‘Boxall Profile’ tool.  To complete course accreditation, I was required to independently complete observations, a full Boxall Profile assessment and learner action plan in addition to an assignment around the theory of nurture groups provision. In addition to heightening my knowledge and enhancing my skills, I experienced how to lead a learner completing a ‘full nurture group cycle’. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.2 How did mentoring or coaching influence the way you learned and/or the outcomes of your learning?**  Attending the Nurture Group Practitioner provided me with contact details to the course leader outside of the delivery hours. The course leader proved to be a valuable coach by encouraging me to challenge my pre-conceived ideas and to review information from the nurture principle perspective.  Internal to my organisation I was able to discuss my findings with colleagues, similar to a mentor relationship. As experienced professionals that had worked with the identified learners and jointly monitored their progressions without having any formal Nurture Group training, I was able to gain unbiased views; related to observations and not to profiling terminology. I valued being able to describe my thoughts and processes with a professional with similar values and core understanding. I found it to be useful prior to transposing to pure nurture principles, terminology and processes.  I found utilising both coach and mentor personalities beneficial to ensure that I balanced my pre-existing ideas with new knowledge and understanding. In addition, I observed that our professional discussions pre-empted a desire for my colleagues to further their own professional development. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.3 What, if any, changes were made along the way? What impact did the review have on the remainder of your learning plan?**  I initially intended to complete the first Boxall Profile in September, closely following when the learner arrived to our provision. After meeting the learner and discussing with our delivery team however, I moved the initial assessment to the October half term. I felt that at this point the learner would be more settled and the assessment be a more accurate reflection of their true current behaviours.  As the learner stayed with us for the remainder of the academic year, there was no further impact to this change, other than completing a post-action assessment at the Easter rather then Christmas holidays. Within a school setting such flexibility with dates may not have been possible due to timetabling and allocated course places.  I believe the learner profile and subsequent action plan were more relevant and creditable as a consequence. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.4 How did you evaluate your intended learning outcomes?**  My Nurture Group course accreditation was externally by the course leader against a set of standardising protocols. Submissions included a pen portrait, observations, Boxall Profile assessments and an action plan. I was able to compare and contrast completed Boxall Profile assessments against course materials, but used discussion with colleagues, my learner and their stakeholders to evaluate validity of other elements.  I was able to evaluate whether one disaffected/disengaged Key Stage 4 learner did not fully meet ‘Nurture Groups’ assessment baselines by analysing the outcome of the initial Boxall Profile assessment. I was able to evaluate if the same learner academically and socially benefited from a formal ‘Nurture Group’ provision following the post action-plan Boxall Profile assessment.  Due to the size of the sample, I was unable to evaluate if this sole learner benefited from formal Nurture Group provision equally to learners that fully meet assessment criteria, however, I could justify making this assumption based on the research outcomes of Nurture Groups Network to date. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.5 What has changed as a result of your learning?**  Following my learning in this area, I am forming the opinion that in 2017, Nurture Groups principles may require developments to bring them inline with modern educational delivery models such as secondary learners accessing and benefiting from a ‘less SEND orientated’ Nurture Groups provision, learners accessing part-time provision.  I have adapted delivery to learners within our centre. Prior to developing my learning in this area, I believed my learners would benefit from our centre becoming an accredited nurture centre, however, I now believe that our current delivery (based more around Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs) including some Nurture Groups principles will be more effective in supporting our disaffected/disengaged learners’ academic and social progression. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.6 How did you share your learning with others?**  My submitted Nurture Groups assignment was requested to be used for future use as a model of ‘best practice’.  Within my organisation, I have since created a ‘one page’ Boxall Profile assessment sheet that my colleagues can use and interpret readily. In conjunction with this, I have introduced the concept of formal nurture groups provision to my team and shared the outcomes of my initial case study as completed for my course.  I shared the concept, assessment methods and outcomes with my learner, their parent/carer and also school learning support assistant and head teacher. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.7 Refer back to the ethical issues you identified in Preparing for the Learning Journey and show how these were considered and if necessary, addressed.**  All created proformas and emailed communication were anonymous, featuring only two initials. No assessments left our education delivery centre and they were stored as per as safeguarding protocols. Information was not shared outside of a ‘need to know’ basis. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.8 Refer back to diversity/equal opportunities issues you identified in Preparing for the Learning Journey. Show how these were considered and what actions you took to secure best possible outcomes.**  The learner I identified to complete the case study with had no identified ‘SEND’, despite them having an open ‘CAF’ (Common Assessment Framework), attending a pupil referral unit since the beginning of their secondary education and being internally classified there as a ‘medium risk’. My early recognition of their underlying needs enabled me to ensure that all activities were undertaken sensitively and in accordance with their specific (but non-formalised) SEND needs.  At no time did I consider deselecting this learner as they were not the ‘classic Boxall Profile’ i.e. a learner that the Nurture Group do not consider as optimum to benefit from formal nurture group provision. |

**Section 4 Learning Breakthrough**

In 2012, having no knowledge or experience with the concept of formal nurture groups, I consciously designed The LEC’s provision for disaffected and disengaged Key Stage 4 (aged 14-16) learners and it’s day-to-day functionality around Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Our learners attend The LEC in place of their extended learning centre placement for one or more days per week. Learners at The LEC typically display disaffected/disengaged behaviours, however they may or may not have identified special educational needs and/or disabilities, be classified as ‘gifted and talented’ in any areas, or have English as their first language.

I translated Maslow’s concept, similarly to Kline (2017), in numerous ways:

- learners feel as though their food, thirst and basic clothing/warmth and safety needs are met, by being greeted on arrival with bright and welcoming colours, comfortable ‘homely’ furniture and the offer of ‘tea and toast’ time;

- learners feel protected and supported by receiving tuition in maximum group sizes of 5, with session times and content clearly labelled and described through the day;

- learners feel as though they belong by being able move freely throughout the space and sharing in making and clearing a ‘unit style’ meal at lunchtime

- learners esteem is raised as through attendance and engagement they begin to achieve academically, via certificated courses and social, emotionally through receipt of positive communications with home and awarding of ‘credits’

- the end goal we have for all learners is that they positively progress (self-actualise) by re-integrating into their formal educational provision, or to further education, training or work.

Post Accredited Nurture Group Training

In 2015, I moved The LEC premises and provision from our larger and more spacious provision to a smaller ‘three-bedroom flat with backyard’ type of premises, in order to make vast financial savings per year. This inevitably meant that I had to make some changes on how our nurturing provision continued and I feared that I may have to lose some of the ‘Maslow-based foundations’ that I had previously embedded, with such positively observed effects.

Concurrently, I attended accredited nurture group training which enabled me to compare and contrast both my previous and current locations and create an action plan to develop The LEC more aligned to recommended nurture group practices. I envisage this to be of further benefit in The LEC being referred learners, as schools are confident in the knowledge that we are delivering curricula that meets the academic, social *and* developmental needs of our disaffected and disengaged learners. Furthermore, should we be able to work with learners to overcome or reduce learning challenges, ultimately learners attending our provision are more likely to positively progress at Post 16, reducing future possibilities of them becoming NEET.

Following my nurture group training, I made the following changes to The (new) LEC:

- I changed a sliding door to a fixed opening and closing to improve acoustics and ‘close/open’ the room

- I had the back garden aesthetically fenced with secure gates fitted

- I added a double swing set and boxing bag with gloves to the back garden

- I added automatic lights to the alleyway entrance

- I added an aesthetic storage unit inside the entrance to cover an old stairway to seem more welcoming

- I bought a halogen tabletop oven so that we could still make pizzas

- I changed our smallest room from a class seating arrangement to soft-seated breakout area

The accredited nurture group training introduced me to a whole new concept of ‘Boxall Profiling’ (See **Section 1**). Prior to attending this training, I would recognise all of our learners as having generic behavioural and educational specific and additional needs, however as a provision we had no formal method of assessing their social, emotional and behavioural difficulties, with no structured recommended intervention or progression measures. Since attending training, we have introduced completing an initial Boxall Profile assessment on the learner’s third week of attendance. We compare our outcomes with those of a Boxall Profile completed by the learner’s home school and of their risk assessment, including positive behaviour management strategies and any additional information such as Professional’s reports. This enables us to create individual learner targets, which we can then discuss with the learner and school, agree and review at half termly intervals. I am of the opinion that introducing this process has provided more opportunities for focused discussion around behaviours and instilled a confidence in the delivery team members in suggesting and monitoring positive intervention strategies. As highlighted by Nicholls (2016) however, Boxall Profiles are “produced and sold by the Nurture Group Network”. This may lead sceptics to query if any alternative impartially sourced assessment may be more beneficial to assessing learner needs.

Through attending the accredited nurture group training I understood that there were different categories of formally recognised nurture groups. I recognised that The LEC I set up in 2012 aligned very closely to the definition of a ‘*new variant’* type of Nurture Group setting. Couture (2012) described a number of researched nurture group models including *new*, *classic* and *aberrant*, all with different variants; “adhering to the important principles of the classic model, but differs in structure and/or organisational features”. The Nurture Group Network (2015) recognises ‘*Classic Boxall’* as the model for a nurture group to gain accreditation. One significant feature of this being that learners attend 80% of their academic timetable (four days per week), prior to being re-integrated into their mainstream provision. In a new variant model learners may attend nurture provision between half and four days per week.

Cooper and Whitebread (2007) propose that only the ‘*Classic*’ and ‘*New Variant*’ models can be seen as genuine Nurture Groups. In contrast, ‘Groups Informed by Nurture Group Principles’ are said to “provide emotional support as opposed to focused intervention and ‘Aberrant’ groups could be considered as a potentially dangerous model promoting a distorted image of the original approach” Furness (2014, p4). I maintain that our LEC, which may be defined by the Nurture Groups Network as a *New Variant* model, would be unsuccessful as a ‘Classic Boxall’ delivery, as the methods of delivery (timings, curricula, facilities) are not in keeping with modern Key Stage 4 learner provision.

Perceived Challenges in Delivering as an Accredited Nurture Group

A primary concern is that The LEC is not recognised formally as a nurture provision as our Key Stage 4 learners typically only attend for one day per week in contrast to recommendations that learners attend four days per week. In response to this potential criticism, I would argue that our learners attend on a weekly basis throughout an entire academic year, which, can be more beneficial for a 14-16 year old learner that will progress into a community learning environment, rather than a protected school setting. Our learners travel independently to our provision, by repeatedly attending our highly structured provision, our learners benefit equally to those as per a more traditional nurture offer.

A further developed criticism to the former could be, that as learners intentionally attend our provision for a complete academic year, we are not attempting to re-integrate them as per Classic Boxall recommendations. Boxall 2002, p.214) makes no reference to re-integration to other environments, other than to a mainstream class in nursery, primary (or assumed secondary) school. This would suggest that nurture environments for learners excluded from their mainstream provision that follow part-time timetables with embedded alternative provisions and are reaching the end of their mandatory schooling, are not catered for in current accredited nurture group standards.

In response, I would argue that we, as educators, have a duty to prepare our learners for entering positive progression routes that are within their community and external to a school setting as more traditionally seen in a nurture group setting. Marjorie Boxall, a pivotal figure in founding the diagnostic tool, Boxall Profile and documented in numerous sources as founding and developing nurture groups, associated closely with Attachment Theory. Colley (2011, p4) evaluated a *range* of developmental theories in a bid to understand the concepts associated with nurture group intervention and further commented on social cognitive theory and on the works of Piaget, Vygotsky and Maslow, whom, he claimed “approached childhood understanding as part of a development process rather than focusing on needs of students with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties”.

As such, I would argue that the more our learners can independently and routinely attend structured provision outside of their home school, the more we are likely to increase their success in attending a positive progression where there is significantly less nurturing support. Seal and Harris (2016, p.230) described a young person’s bond to the community of society as essential to their development. This could also be aligned to feeling ‘safe’ and ‘belonging’ in Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Harris continued to describe Hirschi’s 1969 theory associated to social ties. He commented that when observed, “participant’s in his study changed their behaviours upon being removed from school, including changing their peers”. If we can therefore provide an extended and consistent nurture opportunity where learners mix with peers outside of their home location, we may facilitate a more sociable and less stressful positive progression into Post 16 provisions.

Post Accredited Nurture Group Training

Whilst I am encouraged by modifications I have made to The LEC since attending the training, I may still have a goal to receive a Nurture Groups Network ‘Quality Mark Award’ and acknowledge that I have challenges to overcome in order for an application to be considered:

- our learners attend for one day per week throughout an academic year, as opposed to four;

- we would need to ensure that we have clearly publicised policies detailing how nurture provision is our core delivery mechanism and show how our referral partners understand and acknowledge this offering;

- we would need to consider how we would share information about our nurture provision with parent/carers;

- we would benefit from my primary associate team attending a formal training course;

- we may need to consider how we could encourage more frequent visits and interactions from the learner’s home school link;

- we may need to consider further formalising the review of Boxall Profile scores and filing more detailed action points within minutes;

- we may need to agree with referrers how we can measure the impact of our formal nurture provision upon their re-integration, or, positive progression. Hilton (2014, p.161) observed learners experiencing difficulties simply being re-integrating to their former provision and ending their nurture group engagement;

- we would need to discuss and agree what parental engagement would/could/should look like in our setting.

McGee and Lin (2017, p.1) recognise many factors as causing student disengagement and that alternative education programmes that provide a different pathway, have vastly different interpretations, components and operations. Driscoll and Pianta (2010) cited in Parker et al (2016, p.465) describe how “close and supportive relationships with teachers have demonstrated the potential to mitigate the risk of negative outcomes for children who may otherwise have difficulty succeeding in school”. Interestingly, Parker et al, who focused on attachment and correlating behaviours within schools (Boxall’s core focus when developing the concept of Nurture Groups), made no reference to Boxall or Nurture Groups within their research. This leads me to query if one specific model of Nurture Group delivery can be labelled, as optimum for learners who exhibit a vast range of social, emotional and social needs.

Reflecting on current research and reviewing overall comparisons of two nurture groups Hilton (2014, p.173), I believe that our current nurture group offer provides similar benefits and learner progression to groups that hold the Quality Mark Award. The lack of reference to Nurture Group models of delivery in current research have led me to believe that modifying my practices and beliefs to achieve the Quality Mark Award status would not vastly aid the positive progression of my learners.

**Bibliography**

Boxall, M., 2002. *Nurture Groups in School. Principles and Practice,* London: Paul Chapman Publishing

British Educational Research Association, 2011. *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research 2011,* British Educational Research Association (BERA)

Cole, T., 2015. *Mental Health Difficulties and Children at Risk of Exclusion from Schools in England. A review from an educational perspective of policy, practice and research, 1997 to 2015,* University of Oxford: Emmanouil Agianniotakis

Cole, T., Daniels, H., Visser, J., 2012. *The Routledge Companion to Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties,* Oxon: Routledge

Couture, C (p264-271). *The Value of Nurture Groups in Addressing Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties and Promoting School Inclusion*

Colley, D., 2011. *The Development of Nurture Groups in Secondary Schools,* University of Leicester (unpublished)

Coventry City Council, 2016. *Equality and Diversity Policy,* Work Related Learning

Ealing County Council, 2012. *RONI & Early Intervention Report,* Ealing County Council

Furness, A., 2014. *An Exploration of Nurture Groups in Secondary Schools: How they are working in one large shire county in the South-East of England,* University of East London (unpublished)

Hilton, J., 2014. *A multiple case study to explore the implementation and effects of Nurture Groups as an intervention for pupils with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) in secondary schools,* School of Environment, Education and Development: University of Manchester

Kline, T., 2017. *Applying Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs In Our Classrooms,* http://www.changekidslives.org/actions-4/

McGee, J J., Lin F-Y., 2017. *Providing a Supportive Alternative Education Environment for At-Risk Students,* Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth 61:2, 181-187

Nicholls, S., 2016. *Nurture Groups,* http://www.nasen.org.uk/newsviews/nasen-blog.nurture-groups.html: National Association of Special Needs (NASEN)

Norman, P. (2011) *Sustainable strategies for school improvement”: lessons learnt through National Challenge*

Nurture Groups Network, 2015. *The Theory and Practice of Nurture Groups,* London: Nurture Groups Network

OECD (2015) *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators* Paris: OECD Publishing

Ofsted, 2011. *Supporting Children with Challenging Behaviour through a Nurture Group Approach,* London*:* Crown Copyright

Parker, R., Rose, J., and Gilbert, L., 2016. Attachment Aware Schools: An Alternative to Behaviourism in Supporting Children’s Behaviour? *The Palgrave International Handbook of Alternative Education* 30 p.463-483, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-41291-1\_30

Rae, T., Colley, D., Roden, W. and Stollery, H., 2013. *Beyond the Boxall Profile for Young People. Strategies and Resources,* The Nurture Group Network.

Seal, M., Harris, P., 2016. *Responding to Youth Violence Through Youth Work,* Bristol: Policy Press

Special Needs Information Press (SNIP), 2007. *Behaviour Audit,*

http://www.snip-newsletter.co.uk/pdfs/downloads/behaviour\_audit.pdf

Welsh Assembly Government, 2010. *Nurture Groups: A handbook for schools*, Wales: Crown copyright

**Appendices**

**Appendix 1: Pen Portrait**

Rob attends the city council’s extended learning centre for Key Stage 3 learners, since being permanently excluded from his secondary school. Rob attends our provision one day per week and is timetabled to attend another youth activity provision one day per week alongside his extended learning centre for two mornings. Rob has voluntarily discussed with us that it is his goal to be re-integrated permanently into mainstream school, however he struggles to fully and appropriately engage at the extended learning centre. Rob has both commented and agreed on how his home (Mum) and school receiving positive feedback about his engagement in our provision will likely support his end goal, however he will still not attend, due to other learners on roll, the other youth provision.

Rob is generically a polite young man who regularly demonstrates that he understands manners and knows appropriate, accepted language and behaviours for given situations. Examples include his use of greetings, automated making and clearing of drinks, following of instructions/acknowledgement of warnings when he chooses. However, Rob regularly displays inappropriate, silly, immature, out of context language and behaviours, which appears to be seek attention and accolade from peers that he feel are ‘higher’ in terms of social circle or more ‘streetwise’/rogue. When working within a very small group, with peer(s) he may see as more ‘equal’ to him, Rob can fully complete academic tasks to a high standard. With other peers present, Rob appears to struggle to concentrate, start and remain on task - even when he is capable of completing the work and his peers are fully on task.


Rob’s referral form records that he has a ‘CAF’ in place and is classified as ‘School Support’. It also records he receives TA support in lessons. ‘Silly’ behaviour is the only recorded trigger.


Rob’s risk assessment categorises him as ‘medium risk’, referred to the extended learning centre due to behaviour issues in mainstream school. Rob’s risk assessment states that he ‘frequently accidentally bullies’, which may be in a racist manner. Rob is rarely absent and his displayed behaviours are believed to be learned and connected with educational difficulties. Trigger points on the risk assessment are recorded as family, control and environmental issues with types of typical observed behaviours (with anybody) including being immature, disruptive, running around, encouraging others to misbehave and silliness in classrooms and corridors.


Positive behaviour management strategies are recorded as working1-2-1, planned withdrawal to/working in a quiet room, specific seating arrangements, positive phone calls and positive postcards home.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of strengths;**  - regular and punctual attendance  - awareness and ability to behave age appropriately  - ability to complete set tasks  - desire to re-integrate into full-time education  - positive and communicative relationship with home | **Summary difficulties;**  - appropriate behaviour in group situations  - repeated inappropriate comments for reaction/ acceptance (often of out of context sexual nature)  - reluctance to be seen by peers as working/on task  - refusal to complete set tasks, distraction of peers |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What Will Be Observed** | **How Observations Will Be Recorded** |
| **Conduct Behaviour** and Emotional Behaviour  This observation will take place during out non-academic/non-learning situations such as on arrival during ‘tea and toast’, break, lunchtime and the plenary activities at the end of the day. | The Welsh Assembly Government (2010) published a web link to a free resource published by The Special Needs Information Press (SNIP, 2007*)* that provides a scoring table to record observations related to a learner’s emotional, behavioural and developmental attainments.  Observations will therefore be recorded as per the scores on the template, with a written interpretation summary following. |
| **Learning Behaviour** and Emotional Behaviour  This observation will take place following delivery of the academic/learning sessions of English, Maths and the current Healthy Living unit.  -----------------------------------------------------------------------  Emotional behaviour will be recorded during both observations with a view to have a constant baseline score for comparison. |

**Appendix 2: Observations**

****

**Appendix 3: Boxall Profile Pre-Intervention and Post**

**Appendix 4: Action Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nurture Group – Target Setting** | | | | |
| **Learner Name:**  “Rob” | **DOB:**  Aged 14, Year 9 | **School:**  The LEC | **Start Date:**  November 2016 | **Review Date:**  March 2017 |
| **Overall Target:** To re-integrate into mainstream provision | | | | |
| Identified difficulties | Targets to be achieved | Activities, Strategies & Resources | Measured by…  (Success criteria / positive targets) | Results/Outcomes |
| Striving to be accepted as the person he perceives as wanting to be.  Displaying inappropriate behaviours, staying off task. | (1) Only speak the truth  (2) Aim to act maturely, with acceptable topics of conversation | (1) Respond to prompt/game “Fact of Fiction” and ‘answer’ with eye contact  (2) Immediately stop conversation when word “inappropriate” is spoken by any of the team | (1) Reduced observations of inappropriate behaviours/ actions  (2) Conversations stopped/ immediately changed upon hearing word | ‘Credits’ awarded for positive responses  (a) texts and (b) phone calls are made per agreed number of credits earned |
| Lack of aspirations and belief in own abilities.  Not attempting, or not completing tasks. | (1) Complete all set tasks  (2) Stay on requested task for the allocated time | (1) Ask for your work to be marked immediately upon completion!  (2) Use/request the sand timer as a visual guide for how long you need to stay focused and undistracted by | (1) Set tasks are completed in folder  (2) Engagement remains throughout duration of sand timer | Recognition is made on portfolio work, work shared with school and with home  ‘Credits’ awarded for *both* remaining on task throughout the sand timer and completing the task |
| Changing displayed behaviours according to environmental or persons. | (1) Refrain from inappropriate comments/actions  (2) Work/act consistently, whoever is present | (1) Immediately stop conversation when word “inappropriate” is spoken by any of the team  (2) Complete all set tasks as per your previous target | (1) Conversations stopped/ immediately changed upon hearing word  (2) Set tasks are completed in folder | (a) texts and (b) phone calls are made per agreed number of credits earned  As per second target, in addition, reflection meeting *at* school and additionally *at home* to recognise positives and progression |

**Appendix 5: Observation Analysis and Action Plan**

6a) Pre-Intervention Analysis of the Observations

Within informal settings, Rob appears to regularly display inappropriate and socially unacceptable behaviours, however these are generally positively adapted when he enters formal learning environments suggesting that he understands and accepts requirements. However, inappropriate and uncontextual behaviours are still regularly and spontaneously observed.

Informally, Rob is observed to chat at ease with adults, happily use his phone independently, or to recall/brag about inappropriate or unlikely stories to his peers. Within classroom group settings, Rob displays no issues with being placed in groups, however he does not complete assigned tasks (either independently or as a group member) and does not appear to categorise his peers as his friends.

Rob generally appears a happy person with a sense of humour and positive outlook in both settings.

Whilst socialising informally, Rob does not appear to expect to receive praise, or feel that it is real or warranted when directed at him. Similarly in a task and learning environment, Rob has been observed to participate to a degree, but take no pride in the end product or have no expectation that he can do it well. Contrary to observations in both settings, we have experience that Rob thrives on his home (Mum) and his school receiving positive feedback about his performance.

Overall, the observation scores in the informal setting were lowest (36%) in the ‘empathy’ and ‘socially aware’ categories, compared to 57% and 53% respectively in the learning setting. In the learning setting, observation scores were lowest (33%) in the ‘confident’ and ‘emotionally stable’ categories, compared to 57% and 47% respectively in the informal setting. The difference in scores in the emotional category may indicate that Rob’s emotional state does change when he enters different environments and settings.

The yellow sections of the both the learning and conduct observations (Appendices 2 and 3) highlight areas that Rob was observed to have lower scores, however, detailed analysis of the observations is not the primary focus of this assignment.

6b) Action Plan

Using my professional judgement, experience, discussions with colleagues and suggested strategies by Rae et al (2013), prior to agreeing the Action Plan (Appendix 4: Action Plan), I have shortlisted potential positive intervention strategies in order to progress areas that Rob appears to be less competently functioning in:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Potential Strategies** |
| Striving to be accepted as the person he perceives as wanting to be.  Displaying inappropriate behaviours, staying off task | * Clearly listing, specific, inappropriate words/phrases/actions and associated internal consequences * Use of ‘code’/discreet word/action between team and Rob, that peers do not recognise or acknowledge * Tactically ignore observed inappropriate behaviour |
| Lack of aspirations and belief in own abilities.  Not attempting, or not completing tasks | * Set specific tasks as group around table before moving them to individual spaces facing the wall, then bring back in, etc. * Deliver sessions in different rooms differentiated by academic levels * Use personal sand timer to indicate minimal time to stay on task/not receive attention/before being brought back in whatever progress has been made (i.e. not mandatory that the task has been finished) * Mark immediately and give visual and verbal effort and attainment score * Use only very specific and directed praise and relate positively to expectations * Engage with throughout set task |
| Changing displayed behaviours according to environmental or persons | * Be extremely explicit about expectations, with tangible rewards * Ensure the day template is visible and used correctly as day progresses * Ensure environments are routinely changed/rotated throughout each activity * Provide an outlet for non-adult guided time at lunch * 1-2-1 to conclude if met targets/agreement(s) at the end of each day * Reflect with learner and home, school at respective premises focusing on positives |

**Appendix 7: Written Report: “Rob”**

As per his pen portrait (Appendix 1: Pen Portrait), “Rob” (name changed to preserve anonymity) turned fourteen in January and is currently in Year 9 following a part-time timetable at the only city-run extended learning centre (locally referred to as a ‘PRU”; pupil referral unit) for Key Stage 3 learners. Rob describes that he enjoyed attending primary school and that it is his goal to be re-integrated into a specific local secondary school, however there are other schools that he would refuse to attend due to other learners that are on roll there. Rob currently has an open CAF (Common Assessment Framework) with an assigned ‘Children and Families First’ keyworker and he has a Special Educational Needs (SEN) status of ‘School Support’.

Upon referral, Rob had a recorded attendance of 65.6% and academic working levels in English and Maths as Entry Level 1 – which we believe to be inaccurate following initial speaking, listening and social communications. Rob may be considered as slightly overweight for his age and size and at times he does make verbal reference to ‘being fat’. However, from our initial observations, we do not perceive his weight to be a leading cause of behaviours that cause concern within an educational setting.

Rob has been selected for this study, as we believe that as a Year 9 learner, he has the social and academic abilities and the personal desire to be successfully re-integrated into a mainstream academic environment, in time for him to complete his Key Stage 4 education. From our acquired knowledge, Rob rarely attends, engages or stays on task within his extended learning setting and he does not attend his other scheduled youth activity provision. Rob currently has a attendance rate of 83% with us and as such we believe that we have an opportunity to support his re-integration through our nurture setting.

Boxall Profile (i)

Rob’s initial Boxall Profile was completed after attending three, complete daylong sessions, as it was intended he had time to settle into the routine, and familiarise himself with the expected standards within our provision and for our team to be able to observe his typical behaviours.

Rob’s initial Boxall Profile (Appendix 3, Pre-Intervention) identified two developmental strands (G, J) that he was perceived as least competently functioning in, followed by two (A, H) he was not quite competently functioning in. The categorisation for these being (G, J) displaying as -4 and -3 below the indicator scores and (A, H) displaying as -1 and 0 in comparison with the indicator scores. According to the pre-intervention profile results, Rob was completely functioning in six of the developmental strands (B, C, D, E and F, I).

Rob’s diagnostic profile highlighted two areas (T, W) as Rob least competently functioning in with respective scores of +11 and +10. Four strands displayed as more competently functioning; Q = +6, R = +7, X = +6, Y = +5. Rob only had one diagnostic score (Z) displaying as competently functioning.

Observation (i)

Conduct and Emotional behaviours were observed in informal situations and recorded using a scoring table (SNIP, 2007*)* devised to relate to a learner’s emotional, behavioural and developmental attainments. In the conduct category, Rob was observed to score 36% in the ‘maintains appropriate relationships with pupils’ and 37% in ‘only interrupts and seeks attention appropriately’. The remaining three categories recorded scores a minimum of 50%.

In the emotional category, observations in both the ‘confident’ ‘emotionally stable’ categories scored 33% as opposed to the remaining three categories that scored a minimum of 53%.

Observation (ii)

Learning and Emotional behaviours were observed on the same day, in formal learning sessions using the same scoring tables (SNIP, 2007). In the learning category, seven of the thirty-two (21%, approximately one fifth) of the observations were scored as ‘1, not at all’. Three of the categories, ‘attentive and has an interest in school’, ‘has good learning organisation’, ‘seeks help when necessary’ scored 33% or below compared to the remaining two categories which scored a minimum of 50%.

In the emotional category, observations in the both the ‘has empathy’ and ‘is socially aware’ categories scored 36%, the three remaining categories showed scores of minimum 47%.

Pre-Intervention Analysis of the Boxall Profile

According to Nurture Group Network (2015, p.22), in the developmental strands, A-E are the “most basic skills… that need to be dealt with first… F-J are the next areas to develop”. Within these highlighted strands, Rob identified as least competently functioning in G (biddable and accepts constraints) and J (maintains internalised standards). Strands A and H of the same ilk scored as nearly competently functioning.

Rob’s diagnostic profile showed T (shows inconsequential behaviour) and W (has undeveloped/insecure sense of self) as significantly least competently functioning compared to the other diagnostic profile scores. Q, R, X and Y were scored as (less-significantly) not competently functioning.

Interpreting the scores further, Nurture Group Network (2015, p.22) describes how both sectional scores should be considered together and that particular relationships may be identified between G & T, A & Q. In addition, for Q & R that “until these improve you will make limited progress”.

With G, J, T, W scoring as the least competently functioning and G & T relating to each other, I have analysed these in further detail with reference to Rob:

**G** – Rob appears to find it difficult to ignore external stimuli, to follow requests and refocus on new instructions. Rob will refuse to work/engage and will actively seek to disrupt others, make inappropriate comments/actions, rather than provide the requested attention.

**J** – Rob disregards reasoned requests to complete a task, including when it will benefit him individually. Rob will generally find or create more personally appealing distractions and seek to maintain some form of self-created bravado.

**T** – Rob appears impulse driven and displays behaviour seeking to impress peers or make others perceive that he is more interesting/daring/courageous than perhaps he is. Rob regularly uses inappropriate language and describes scenarios which appear to place him in the role of an older and more ‘streetwise gangster’ and sexually active young man. Rob appears to seek reaction including plaudits from his peers.

**W** – Rob seeks positive responses to his stories, comments, actions in front of others. Rob seeks acceptance of the character he is portraying. To adults, he often discloses conversations he has had with Mum, suggesting a nurturing home relationships and compliancy and healthy adult interactions. Rob seeks attention by his actions and his methods of communication.

With more intervention, I may choose to further analyse Q & R as priorities.

Pre-Intervention Analysis of the Observations

The yellow sections of the both the learning and conduct observations (Appendices 2) highlight areas that Rob was observed to have lower scores, however, detailed analysis of the observations is not the primary focus of this assignment. A more detailed analysis can be reviewed at Appendix (6a).

Pre-Intervention Interpretation of the Boxall Profile and Observation Analyses

Both the outcomes of the Boxall Profile and two observations appear to indicate that:

* Rob has an on-going desire to be accepted as the person he perceives he wants to be seen as;
* Rob seeks praise/applause/acceptance/awe through his inappropriate and uncontextual actions/comments;
* Rob does not appear to recognise given praise is real/deserved/warranted;
* Rob thrives on positive feedback that is communicated with home (Mum) and school;
* Rob is generally happy and pleasant, non-malicious with good attendance and a desire to attend;
* Rob will quickly change his behaviour according to environmental and peer changes;
* Rob does not appear to have genuine friends within our or the extended learning centre provisions and has a desire to ‘fit in’ with what he may see as desirable traits of other peers;
* Rob is less likely to give up on tasks and more likely to attempt when working in an independent space and without perceived pressure of ‘streetwise’ peers present;
* Rob appears unable to ignore distractions, preferring to want to ‘fit in’;
* Rob is likely to leave a task unfinished deeming it too hard, for bravado or due to distracting/being distracted.

Action Plan

I used my professional judgement, experience, discussions with colleagues and suggested strategies by Rae et al (2013), prior to agreeing the Action Plan (Appendix 5: Action Plan). Appendix (6a) documents potential positive intervention strategies that I shortlisted, in order to progress areas that Rob appears to be less competently functioning in.

Boxall Profile (ii)

In the developmental strands, the score for H remained the same, and strands A, D, E, F and J had increased scores of +1. Strands D, E and F already showed Rob as functioning competently in these areas, however strands A and H now appear to show Rob at the functioning competently level. Strands G and J (the weakest scores from completion of the first Boxall Profile) still show that Rob is not functioning competently in these areas, however he has made progress.

In the diagnostic profile, strands Q, S, Y and Z scored the same and the remainder of the strands, whilst improving by either 1 score (U), 2 scores (R, W, X) or 3 scores (T) did not show Rob to be currently functioning competently in any of the aforementioned areas.

Further observation between the scores is that in the developmental strand, no original scores of 3 or 4 changed in the second profiling exercise, nor did any original scores of 2 or 1 in the diagnostic profile. This could indicate observer bias.

Perceived Impact of Intervention To Date

Rob attended nine day long sessions between the completion of each Boxall Profile, was absent on two occasions and had a Christmas outing/celebration on one other.

Throughout the nurture intervention, positive progression has been observed comparing the two Boxall Profile scores in all four targeted areas: G, J, T, W. Both G and J indicate that in the developmental strands, Rob is now only ‘two scores’ away from functioning competently in both of these areas. Should Rob’s scores increase by two in both, his profile will show him as functioning competently in all of the developmental strands. The second diagnostic profile scores for T and W both showed significant -8 scores for how Rob is perceived to be functioning competently. However, both areas still showed a marked reduction of 11 and 1- respectively.

Comparing the improved scores of the target areas G and J suggests Rob has begun to acknowledge requests to complete tasks and is making efforts to maintain attention through a directed time. The less improved scores of T and W may indicate whilst improvements in his behaviour have been observed, he is still struggling to refrain from inappropriate or out of context comments/actions.

Next Steps to Prepare for Re-Integration

Categories S, Y and Z appeared to make the least improvements. Therefore, if the existing target areas of T and W become the main foci, the aim would be that Rob begins functioning more competently in all five of these, at time of the next review.

We have had conversations surrounding re-integration into mainstream education with Rob and he is aware that he will firstly need to successfully engage with formal learning at the extended learning centre - prior to the end goal becoming a reality. To this end, we aim to celebrate Rob’s progress in remaining more on task, attempting learning activities and being less/causing less distractions in the classroom, *with* the extended learning centre, in the hope that he mirrors these behaviours there and progresses them even further.

At this point, we would now like to jointly meet with his extended learning team (and possibly Mum) to revise the current action plan and agreed a joint one, developing from the successes we have seen and the strategies we have used to date.

Authentication

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **By submitting this project to the Teaching & Learning Academy, you declare the contents relate to work you have carried out in the context of your role at your school/college and the evidence presented is your own work and that you are happy to share its contents with the TLA Learning Community.**  **Please give details of your head teacher or line manager that can confirm this to be true. The person detailed here may be contacted to authenticate your work.** | | | |
| **Name:** | Becki Coombe | **Institution Name:** | Newman University |
| **Contact email:** | becki.coombe@thelearn2.org.uk | **Institution Address:** | Genners Lane, Birmingham |
| **Contact phone number:** | 07841 378 404 |

Verification Criteria for Recognition 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Preparing for the Learning Journey**  **At Recognition 2 evidence of the following is presented in the learning journal.....** | **YES** | **NO** |
| A clear learning and change focus, identified and refined in **dialogue with coach or mentor**, with consideration given to:   * The context of the individual’s role, institution, career and previous professional development * The influence of engagement with **relevant practice and knowledge, including theory and research** * Analysing the relevance of the focus, directly or indirectly, to learners’ learning * Influence of the stage of professional development |  |  |
| Ethical considerations and diversity/equal opportunities issues have been identified. |  |  |
| **Planning the Learning Journey**  **At Recognition 1 evidence of the following is presented in a plan...,** | **YES** | **NO** |
| The plan includes:   * Appropriate, specific and feasible outcomes and success criteria * Actions intended to achieve these * Resources required to achieve these including time, support and intellectual resources * Timescales and key dates * Sources of **support and challenge** * Progress review * When and how to **share** learning and progress with others **beyond immediate sphere of influence i.e. across key stage, department or school** * **Evaluation** of timings and actions |  |  |
| **On the Learning Journey**  **At Recognition 2 evidence of the following is presented in the learning journal……** | **YES** | **NO** |
| There has been consistent **engagement with sources of knowledge** and practice to change activity. The influence of this has been clearly reflected upon. |  |  |
| There has been consistent professional **dialogue with coach or mentor/s** across a range of issues arising from the change and learning process. The specific ways coaching/mentoring has contributed is identified and reflected upon. |  |  |
| The **plan** and progress have been reviewed and monitored at key points with amendments to the plan as needed. Changes to original intentions or plans have been explained. |  |  |
| Changes to practice and learning outcomes are **evaluated**. The evaluation includes learner and/or colleague feedback and the connection between our learning and that of learners or colleagues is identified. |  |  |
| Ethical issues have been considered and addressed where necessary with an explanation of any action taken. |  |  |
| Diversity/equal opportunity issues within the focus are precisely identified and, as relevant, the approach to securing best possible outcomes is described and reflected upon.. |  |  |
|  | **YES** | **NO** |
| A range of opportunities have been taken to **share the learning** and changed practice to **influence others** beyond the individual’s immediate sphere of influence i.e. Across the key stage, department or school. |  |  |
| **The Learning Breakthrough**  **At Recognition 2 evidence of the following is presented in the learning journal…** | **YES** | **NO** |
| A descriptive and reflective account of a learning breakthrough (i.e. a critical learning incident) which includes:   * The impact on the individual’s learning * How the plan and practice were affected * The importance to the learning of learners and/or colleagues/s   Next steps taken |  |  |