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Abstract

Background: Alternative provision (AP) for permanently excluded YPs of compulsory school age typically takes the form of pupil referral units (PRUs). PRUs ultimately aim to support and prepare YPs for a timely and successful reintegration to mainstream provision. Documented reintegration failures highlight a need for research that targets AP outcomes and informs reintegration practice.

Methods/Participants: A systematic literature review (SLR) synthesises the existing research evidence regarding the reintegration experiences of YPs. Eight studies, including one international study, were critically appraised and synthesised following PRISMA guidelines. An empirical investigation, adopting an exploratory multiple case study methodology investigates stakeholders’ reintegration experiences within the local context through individual interviews. Preliminary interview data and reintegration documentation were additionally gathered.

Analysis/Findings: The SLR identified three global themes: outcomes of reintegration; factors that support reintegration (facilitators); factors that limit reintegration success (barriers). The findings were configured into a chronological reintegration journey model. Paper Two provides a detailed overview of both case studies, with constant comparative thematic analysis findings presented. The findings lead to a discussion of the overarching commonalities and differences of the case studies and a reintegration model that builds upon the findings of Paper One.

Conclusion/Implications: Paper One considers implications for reintegration practice and provides recommendations for future research. Paper two considers the use of a reintegration practice framework in supporting practitioners involved within the reintegration journeys of YPs. Recommendations of approaches for addressing reintegration facilitators and barriers, considering the role of educational psychologists, are discussed with implications for future research. Paper Three discusses evidence-based practice in relation to the role of practitioner psychologists. Plans for dissemination of findings, and professional practice implications, are discussed.
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Introduction

Research aims

The aim of this thesis was to explore the journey of young persons (YPs)\textsuperscript{1} from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). The presented research intended to address an identified gap in the literature to explore this specific form of reintegration in relation to secondary school YPs. It strove to provide a definition of a successful reintegration and an understanding of the facilitators and barriers that are involved in its success. The thesis presents three papers. Paper One is a systematic literature review (SLR) of the reintegration experiences of YPs reintegrating to mainstream secondary school (MSS) through alternative provision (AP), following permanent exclusion. The SLR adhered to guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta Analyses (PRISMA) (Moher et al., 2009). PRISMA is an evidence-based set of guidelines that are designed to support researchers in their scientific and transparent reporting of a review’s rationale, design, and findings (Page et al., 2021). In a study evaluating the effectiveness of using PRISMA guidelines, Panic et al. (2013) found increases in reporting and methodological quality of studies adhering to PRISMA. Paper One presents three global themes identified from the existing evidence base: outcomes of reintegration; factors that support reintegration (facilitators); factors that limit reintegration success (barriers). The findings evidence variability in the methodological quality of the reintegration research identifying a need for future research to gather multiple, integrated stakeholder perspectives that allow for a greater exploration of reintegration facilitators, barriers, readiness, and outcomes.

Paper One’s recommendations inform the research design and focus of Paper Two. This empirical study investigates stakeholders’ reintegration experiences within the local context through individual interviews forming two case studies. Cross-case synthesis findings are configured into a ‘reintegration journey’ model of global themes and associated subthemes, considering facilitating and limiting factors at each stage of the reintegration journey (before, during, and after the AP placement).

\textsuperscript{1} Throughout this introduction, the terms ‘YP’, ‘child and young person (CYP)’, ‘pupils’, and ‘students’ will be used differentially according to the person’s stage of education, status as a student or excluded child, and consistent with the terminology used within the referenced sources.
Paper Three considers evidenced-based practice, practice-based evidence, and the dissemination of evidence to professional practice. It discusses the research implications of Paper One and Paper Two and outlines a strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination of findings.

The researcher’s professional background and relevant experience

The researcher is currently a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) within her final year of training on The University of Manchester’s Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology. This is a three-year full-time initial professional training programme for educational psychologists approved by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). The programme provides effective coverage of the required core curriculum for training in educational psychology provided by the British Psychological Society (BPS). The learning experiences gained in the researcher’s current role as TEP, and from previous roles have equipped her with the skills to work with CYPs with a range of complex needs.

Prior to beginning her doctoral EP training, the researcher’s previous roles as Assistant Psychologist and Teaching Assistant enabled her to gain experience across mainstream, specialist, and children’s care homes, in supporting CYP with significant needs around social communication, social, emotional, mental health (SEMH), and trauma. Within her TEP role, the researcher has developed her knowledge of SEMH needs through continued professional development opportunities including delivering training to schools to develop practitioners’ knowledge, skills, and trauma-informed practice. Within these roles the researcher drew upon her relational and emotional resiliency skills and knowledge developed through working with looked after children with experiences of trauma, supporting the team around them, and working collaboratively with the virtual school within her current LA TEP placement. The researcher gained experience of using effective methods for engaging CYPs from key stage 1 (age 5 years) to post-16 (up to 18 years) in sharing their views and aspirations. Given the vulnerability surrounding the topic of school exclusion and AP placements, the researcher drew upon her experiences as Assistant Psychologist to support the YP participants, and the parent participant to engage with the research using a sensitive line of questioning to avoid triggering any significant emotional reactions.

Further ethical issues were considered within the research. Case study selection within Paper Two was completed through a participant gatekeeper who, with the researcher, ensured YPs
who had experienced personally significant or potentially sensitive events were not invited to participate in the research. For the two YPs that were included within the study, efforts were made by the researchers to ensure they were not destabilised by the data gathering process. Ethical approval for the research was granted by The University of Manchester.

**Axiology, ontology and epistemology**

The researcher’s axiological, ontological, and epistemology assumptions run throughout the research presented within this thesis. Axiology is defined as the values and beliefs we hold about viewing and understanding the world (Cohen et al., 2018). The researcher’s experiences of working with CYPs within her roles has developed values that inform this thesis research. The researcher is a promoter of inclusion, equality, and every CYP’s right to education. The needs of CYPs were central to this research; marrying with the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child that was prominent within the researcher’s doctorate training. The Rights of the Child states that a child’s education should develop their personality, talents, and abilities, with all decision and actions prioritising the best interests of the child (UN, 1989). The researcher promotes inclusive education, believing each child has a place in mainstream, just as every person within society should have equal access to opportunities and support. The researcher feels this may be the driving factor behind her motivation to tell the YPs’ stories, perhaps as a mechanism for restorative justice. The researcher reflects that their beliefs surrounding inclusion, may have developed into a sense of injustice and unfairness for the permanent exclusion the YPs had received, that was then reflected within the interview questions of Paper Two’s research. As well as the voice of the child, the researcher values continued professional development and learning. In holding these beliefs, the researcher carried out the research with the aim of gathering findings that could inform and bring about positive change for CYPs through developing the knowledge and skills of those involved within their education and reintegration journeys. As the researcher holds a collaborative ethos and she strives to empower others, the commissioners were invited to be co-publishers of academic outputs for Paper One, as they will be for Paper Two.

Epistemology concerns knowledge; how humans have come to acquire knowledge and how it can be judged as adequate and legitimate (Lewis-Beck et al., 2004). The researcher positions herself within the contextual constructivist paradigm, assuming we are “knowing beings who construct knowledge that is personally meaningful” (Cobern, 1993, p.53). Taking a contextual
constructivist stance towards knowledge and learning leads to methods allowing for an investigation of what knowledge is held by those involved in the process of reintegration. This position can be seen through the research of Paper Two, which aims to explore the experiences of stakeholders involved within the reintegration journeys of YPs. Fox (2003) explains how EPs use their experiences as reflective practitioners to construct explanations for others, advising those taking a constructional view to recognise the reasoning processes that underpin the actions of others. A constructivist perspective was similarly taken within Paper One’s SLR in exploring the reintegration phenomenon through synthesising findings from studies conducted in a range of different contexts.

The researcher’s epistemological assumption is complemented by critical realism, an ontology that assumes reality “exists independently of those who observe it but is only accessible through the perceptions and interpretations of individuals” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p.21). Critical realism assumes we experience and interpret reality using our languages, cultures, and political beliefs (Braun & Clarke, 2013). The researcher’s philosophical outlooks led to particular choices within the participant recruitment and data gathering phases of the research presented within Paper Two. While a social constructivism approach would fit with the researcher’s axiological position of valuing the voice of the child, the researcher was keen for this research to be an investigative study. While critical realists accept that the world is to some degree socially constructed, they believe the ‘real-world’ can impact upon the complex stories we have created (Easton, 2010). The researcher accepted that the YP participants would have their own perspectives, and that these would be shaped by their experiences of: exclusion, a possible sense of rejection, transition to The PRU, and MSS reintegration. The findings and their constructed realities were considered in light of these previous experiences. Utilisation of inductive analysis data, constructing themes from the participants responses without considering pre-existing theoretical frameworks or ideas (Patton, 2002), together with researcher-participant discussions, were considered important in increasing the research’s reliability and trustworthiness. In taking a critical realist stance, the researcher sought triangulation within the research data, seeking to integrate the multiple participant accounts. As well as valuing the voice of the child, the researcher prioritised obtaining the YPs’ account due to their ability to provide a comprehensive overview of their journey, having observed the sequence of events in full.
The researcher’s values and assumptions influenced the focus and methodology of the research. A purely positivist stance was deemed inappropriate for the exploratory nature of the research, given its lack of appreciation for the complexity of human beings (Cruickshank, 2012). The aim of this qualitative research was not to uncover a single truth, but instead to explore the phenomenon of reintegration in the local context, recognising the importance of gaining different interpretations to acquire different understandings of the associated participants.

The research commissioning
The thesis research was jointly commissioned by a PRU and an educational psychology service (EPS) in the north of England through The University of Manchester’s (UoM) research commissioning process. The researcher was presented with a range of research topics and commissioning proposals, funded through England’s Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) Initial Training for Educational Psychologists (ITEP) award 2019. Given her previous experience in working with CYPs with SEMH needs at risk of exclusion and those attending specialist provision, the researcher expressed a relative preference for the PRU project. The commissioner’s initial proposal was broad, outlining various possible approaches to the research. Meetings between the researcher, the researcher’s supervisor, and the research commissioners, enabled a focus and research design to be developed. A preliminary study was conducted by the researcher which explored the processes involved in reintegration, following a Fair Access Panel (FAP) meeting, alongside the perspectives of a MSS practitioner. Feeding back these preliminary findings to the research commissioners helped to devise the strategy for the subsequent SLR and empirical study.

Rationale for engagement
In placing importance upon eliciting the voice of the child, the researcher was eager to capture this within the research. Within her TEP placement activities, the researcher built upon their experience of engaging with YPs, particularly those with SEMH needs, to support them in sharing their wishes and feelings. She hoped engaging YPs and their families within the research would further develop her own practice. The UoM’s doctoral research commissioning process provided the researcher with the opportunity to engage with a range of practitioners, including teachers, head teachers, and SENCos, as well as professionals.
within the LA including outreach workers and EPs. The research was further driven by the researcher’s experiences of working with CYPs at risk of, or who have received a permanent school exclusion, and supporting pupils with reintegration, which illuminated her desire to engage in a detailed investigation of reintegration practice.
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Paper One: A systematic literature review exploring the facilitators and barriers of reintegration to secondary mainstream schools through ‘alternative provision’

Prepared for in accordance with the author guidelines for submission to Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties journal (Appendix 1)
A systematic literature review exploring the facilitators and barriers of reintegration to secondary mainstream schools through ‘alternative provision’

Keywords
Mainstream reintegration; alternative provision; exclusion; systematic review

Abstract
This systematic review synthesises the existing research evidence regarding the experiences of young people reintegrated to a mainstream secondary school (MSS) through alternative provision (AP), following permanent exclusion. Eight studies, including one international study, were critically appraised and synthesised following PRISMA guidelines. Three global themes were identified: outcomes of reintegration; factors that support reintegration (facilitators); factors that limit reintegration success (barriers). Findings were configured into a chronological reintegration journey model that outlines the facilitating and limiting factors at three specific stages of the reintegration process: AP support; reintegration planning; reintegration and MSS support. Bringing together multiple stakeholder perspectives from a variety of data sources, this model can serve as a framework for practitioners involved within the reintegration process. This review evidences variability in the methodological quality of the reintegration research evidence and outlines recommendations for future research.

Introduction

School exclusion
School exclusion is considered a ‘last-resort’ response and the most serious educational disciplinary action that continues to be a rising concern across England (Department for Education (DfE) 2017). Significant disparities have been found in examining the landscape of school exclusions and reintegration practice across the four jurisdictions of the United Kingdom (UK). For 2018-2019, school exclusion rates were recorded as 0.4% in Wales (Welsh Government 2019), 0.1% in England (DfE, 2019a), and 0% rate for Scotland (Scottish Government 2019). McCluskey et al. (2019) further distinguished between school exclusion...
policies. Research identifies disproportionately higher rates of exclusion for vulnerable groups, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (DfE 2017). Higher exclusion rates in secondary than primary schools could be explained by differences in expectations, teaching and learning, and provisions for pupil wellbeing (DfE 2019a).

However, exclusion is anomalous to education principles of ‘entitlement’ and ‘protection’, creating policy tensions between schools and local authorities (LAs). The United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989) outlines children and young persons’ (CYPs’2) right to education based on equal opportunity, whilst UK education law states permanent exclusion should be used ‘in response to a serious breach or persistent breaches of the school’s behaviour policy’ (DfE 2017, 6). The welfare of other pupils remains a key factor in the decision to exclude, with ‘persistent disruptive behaviour’ remaining the most common reason for exclusions in England (DfE 2017), inconsistent with the importance placed upon addressing underlying causes of the behaviour (DfE 2017), and in obtaining pupils’ views as enshrined within the special educational needs and disability (SEND) Code of Practice (DfE 2015).

**Alternative provision (AP)**

LAs’ statutory responsibility to make educational provision for permanently excluded CYP often take the form of an ‘alternative provision’ (AP) (DfE 2017), a term encompassing an array of settings including pupil referral units (PRUs) (or ‘learning centres’) (Gibson 2019; Ofsted 2007). PRUs cater for a variety of CYPs’ needs and offer support through a combination of therapeutic approaches, small group teaching and vocational teaching methods (Tate and Greatbatch 2017). Pirrie et al. (2011) recognised the potential adverse effects of exclusion and the disadvantageous outcomes for PRU attendees. Gill, Quilter-Pinner and Swift (2017) found long-lasting harmful implications for physical/mental health, educational attainment, employment, and criminality; DfE (2020) reports just 60% of CYPs from AP moving on age 16 to a sustained destination (education, apprenticeship, or employment). A Welsh government

---

2 Throughout this review the terms ‘CYP’, ‘young person (YP)’, ‘pupils’, and ‘students’ will be used differentially according to the person’s status as a student or excluded child, and consistent with the terminology used within the referenced sources.
review of ‘education otherwise than at school’, encompassing AP, found CYPs’ experiences to be variable, suggesting some positive experiences but also some experience of inappropriate curricula, uneven pastoral support, and few opportunities for reintegration (McCluskey, Riddell and Weedon 2015).

However, Malcolm (2019) connected PRU attendance to the ‘routines and turning points’ dimension within ‘Careership’ theory (Hodgkinson 2008, cited in Malcolm 2019). Young adults considered their PRU experiences as significant turning points within their lives, positively changing their self-perceptions and views towards opportunities for achievement. Notably, a review of alternative education practices in the United States (US) evidenced success in programmes providing a flexible and relevant curriculum, and an environment where students can develop a sense of belonging with personal and meaningful connections with staff (Smith and Thomson 2014).

**Reintegration**

An identified main aim of PRUs is the prompt and successful reintegration of students to mainstream education settings (DfE 2018). This purpose is grounded within mainstream’s espoused benefits of access to a breadth of curriculum and wide-ranging peer relationships that enhance the diversity of the school community (Agius Ferrante 2012). LAs are given autonomy in developing their reintegration policies and practices although are required to develop a Fair Access Protocol to manage the placement of vulnerable CYPs outside of the normal admissions round (DfE 2012), including the ‘Managed Move’ process, a formal, voluntary agreement where a CYP’s placement is considered a trial with a view to permanent admission (Department for Education and Skills (DfES) 2008). Messeter and Soni’s (2018) review of Managed Move literature highlighted collaboration between schools, communication with parents and CYPs, and the development of peer and staff relationships, as integral parts to this process in establishing a CYP’s sense of belonging to their new setting. Research has evidenced similarities between managed moves and reintegration factors. Embeita (2019) found parental accounts of CYPs’ reintegration/Managed Move experiences converged upon three parent-school facilitating factors categorised as: communication, collaboration, and commitment. Unlike previously excluded CYPs reintegrating through AP, pupils transitioning through the Managed Move process will have markedly different
experiences in evading the rejection and the breakdown of relationships associated with permanent exclusion (Munn and Lloyd 2005).

**Rationale and aims**

Previous research reviews have focused on different forms of reintegration through the Managed Move process (Messeter and Soni 2018), and stakeholders’ perceptions of wider outcomes of AP (Taylor 2019), yet research on reintegration of CYP through AP, following a school exclusion, has not (to the researchers’ knowledge) been systematically reviewed. This review intends to provide a comprehensive understanding of the context, processes, and outcomes associated with this distinct form of reintegration. This SLR was jointly commissioned by a PRU and an educational psychology service (EPS) in the north of England through The University of Manchester’s (UoM) research commissioning process and will encompass a wide range of AP, privileging the perspectives of secondary-aged YPs, parents, school staff, AP staff, and other educational practitioners involved at different points in the reintegration journey to mainstream secondary school (MSS), intending to answer the following question:

- What factors do YPs, parents, and educational practitioners, identify as facilitators and barriers to the reintegration to mainstream secondary school through alternative provision?

Research published after March 2014 will be included in this review. This marker is determined by the UK context and a number of important legislative changes within the special education system in England including the completion of: the Children and Families Act 2014 (DfE 2014); the SEND Code of Practice (2015) and The National Curriculum in England (DfE 2013). These reforms provided a different context for the ways in which CYPs are excluded, supported, and reintegrated to mainstream education, through the joint planning and commissioning of services across health, social care, and education (DfE 2014) and focus on person-centred practice.

**Method**

The method for this review was based upon the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher et al. 2009).
**Search Strategy**

Searches were carried out within the period July-October 2020 using six databases: PsycINFO; ERIC (Education Resources Information Center); BEI (British Education Index); Dissertation and Theses Global (PROQUEST); ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts); EThOS (Electronic Theses Online Service). Additionally, Google, Google Scholar, SEBDA (Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties Association) and EPNET (EP Network) were searched for grey literature, and reference harvesting was used in relevant studies. Two sets of search terms, generated from preliminary searches, were used. Set 1: ‘reintegration OR reintegration AND education OR school OR mainstream’ and set 2: ‘transition AND mainstream’. The searches were limited to literature published from March 2014 (post education reforms) to October 2020, with abstracts written in the English language. The search was not restricted to peer reviewed literature given the review’s use of quality assurance measures. This process identified 945 records. Duplicates were removed and the remaining records were screened against a final set of inclusion and exclusion criteria (outlined in Table 1 below), upon reading titles and abstracts. The remaining 22 records were read in full against the inclusion criteria, resulting in the exclusion of a further 14 records, resulting in a total of eight studies to be included for final review.

Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Research from any nation with abstracts written in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Research that is empirical and provides primary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Research focusing on full reintegration through alternative provision/ PRUs/ learning centres/ special schools to MSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Research carried out following (or referencing, if the data collection dates are not stated) the introduction of the Children and Families Bill (February 2013); the Draft SEND Code of Practice (April 2014); the Children and Families Act 2014; or the SEND Code of Practice (DfE 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 2 for a full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria, please contact the researchers.
Critical appraisal

Gough’s (2007) Weight of Evidence (WoE) framework was used to critically appraise the final eight studies. The methodological quality (WoE A) was evaluated by the researcher using The University of Manchester Critical Appraisal Frameworks: Qualitative Research Framework (Woods 2020a) (see Appendix 3a). This framework was utilised to provide a robust, evaluative tool, having been widely used in other SLRs published by practising psychologists (e.g. Flitcroft and Woods 2018). The Qualitative Research Framework (Woods 2020a) provides a maximum score of 20 for each evaluated study, awarding credit based on criteria such as: appropriateness and execution of data collection; clarity of aims and sampling rationale; evidence of reflexivity and validity; and transferability of conclusions.

Four of the studies that employed a mixed methods design were also appraised by the researcher using The University of Manchester Critical Appraisal Frameworks: Quantitative Research Framework (Woods 2020b) (see Appendix 3b). This framework provides a maximum score of 20 for investigation studies, and 29 for evaluation studies. The framework has been used similarly in other SLRs containing mixed method studies (e.g. Tomlinson, Bond, and Hebron 2020). For the quantitative investigation framework, appraisal criteria included: comprehensiveness of data gathering; use of multiple measures; appropriateness of participant sampling, data analysis and interpretation. For the quantitative evaluation framework, additional criteria included use of: randomised group design; manuals or protocols; and fidelity checks.

Qualitative and quantitative appraisal scores were recorded, allowing the range of quality across the literature to be highlighted. Through considering the distribution of scores, the studies were categorised as ‘higher’ for scores 13.25 or above, ‘medium’ for scores 10-13, and ‘lower’ for scores below 10. In acknowledging a potential degree of subjective judgement within the appraisal process, inter-rater measures were employed. At the outset of the critical appraisal of included studies, two of the eight included studies (Corrigan 2014; Atkinson and Rowley 2019) were also appraised by the researcher supervisor; researcher evaluations were compared for the purpose of sensitisation to the critical appraisal criteria.

The studies were further evaluated for their methodological appropriateness (WoE B) (criteria displayed in Table 2), and their appropriateness of focus (WoE C) (criteria displayed in Table 3) (Gough 2007). WoEs A, B and C were then considered to produce a Total Weight of Evidence (WoE D), representing the contribution each study can make in the review.
synthesis (Gough 2007). See Appendix 4 for a summary table containing the WoE evaluations for each of the included studies.

Table 2. Weight of Evidence B: Methodological appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>• Research with multiple, integrated participant group views, including those from YP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Research with multiple participant group views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>• Research with one participant group view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Weight of Evidence C: Appropriateness of focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Higher         | • Participants: secondary aged YP  
• Type of exclusion: permanent exclusion  
• Type of AP: full-time AP  
• Completeness of reintegration: full reintegration to MSS for all YP participants |
| Medium         | • Participants: secondary and primary aged YP  
• Type of exclusion: permanent exclusion  
• Type of AP: full-time AP  
•Completeness of reintegration: full reintegration to MSS for some YP participants with other YP participants attending AP with plans for future reintegration to MSS |
| Lower          | • Participants: secondary and primary aged YP |
Synthesis
A configurative approach was adopted to synthesise the literature to create a conceptual understanding of reintegration practice (Gough, Thomas, and Oliver 2013). The researcher read the eight studies twice, extracting relevant and distinctive practices and outcomes. Using an inductive, iterative approach, different configurations were explored within the literature (Gough, Thomas, and Oliver 2013). The data within each study was coded to develop themes, patterns, and areas of commonality. The objective of the synthesis was for these themes to be developed into a conceptual framework of the facilitators and barriers of reintegration, to provide new understandings to reintegration practice. The researcher strove to give greater representation within the synthesis of the studies appraised to have high methodological quality.

Review of research
Overview of the included studies
Of the eight studies included within the SLR, three were peer reviewed journal articles (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Corrigan 2014; Levinson and Thompson 2014). The remaining five studies, were unpublished theses completed by doctoral students (Perez 2018; Gooding 2014; Gibson 2019; Armstrong 2017; Bakhtiar 2017). The studies were conducted in the UK, with the exception of one study (Perez 2018) which was conducted in the US.

CYP were included as participants within all the studies, and were either able to reflect on their reintegration experiences post-reintegration, or their partial reintegration
experiences where they were attending a PRU with plans for future reintegration to MSS (Perez 2018; Corrigan 2014). Data were primarily collected from secondary schools, although two studies also collected data from primary schools (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Corrigan 2014). As well as CYP, parents; educational practitioners (from AP and mainstream schools); multi-agency professionals; EPs; and trainee EPs, were also included as participants.

Half of the studies employed a mixed methodology. Of these studies, two used a Q-methodology that actively involved participants within the research process (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Armstrong 2017). The other two studies collected qualitative data, in the form of interviews or questionnaires, and quantitative data using either rating questionnaires or post intervention measures (Gooding 2014; Corrigan 2014). Four of the eight studies employed a qualitative methodology that used semi-structured interviews, observational data, or qualitative questionnaires. The qualitative data within the studies were predominately analysed using thematic analysis (Gooding 2014; Corrigan 2014; Armstrong 2017; Bakhtiar 2017, and in: Perez 2018; Levinson and Thompson 2016, although this was not explicitly stated) with the exception of Gibson (2019), who used Interpretative Phenomenology Analysis (IPA). The mixed method studies used ratings analysis (Corrigan 2014), descriptive statistics (Gooding 2014) and factor analysis for the two Q methodology studies (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Armstrong 2017). (A full tabulated summary of the studies can be found within Appendix 4).

Findings

Three global themes, each with associated sub-themes, were identified from the reintegration experiences of YP, parents, and educational practitioners, explored within the studies: outcomes of reintegration; factors that support reintegration (facilitators); factors that limit reintegration success (barriers).

**Theme one: outcomes of reintegration**

**Aspirations and progress**

Stakeholders described the direct, positive impact, that reintegration had upon the YP and their families, enabling learning progression and the development of future aspirations (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Gibson 2019; Gooding 2014). YP reflected upon how AP and MSS practitioners had fostered their re-engagement and acquisition of new skills, reflecting on
how the process has developed their ‘confidence’ (Beth) (Gooding 2014, 94) in considering their future, post-secondary school, for the first time.

Progress and reintegration success was often characterised in the YP’s ability to cope with the demands of mainstream. Practitioners reflected on increased school attendance, and the YP using strategies to help them to remain in the classroom and support their engagement in learning (Corrigan 2014). Participants additionally considered the development of the YP’s emotional understanding and social interaction skills (Levinson and Thompson 2019). Multi-agency practitioners evidenced the success of the process in developing YP’s self-awareness, and a greater understanding of their own strengths and needs (Corrigan 2014), particularly evident in YP drawing comparisons between their past and future selves (Gibson 2019). Parents of reintegrated YPs reflected on the YP having ‘moved on’ from their past difficulties, towards a more positive outlook (Corrigan 2014, 281).

**Inclusion and belonging**

Stakeholders discussed how reintegration had developed YPs’ sense of belonging and facilitated their inclusion into the mainstream school community (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, Perez 2018). Positive reintegration experiences were often characterised by social inclusion. YPs made sense of their reintegration success through the development of peer relationships and having a ‘peer support system’ (Armstrong 2017, 144), suggesting reintegrating to mainstream had helped fulfil their desire to ‘feel normal’ (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, 345).

Baz Tupper: I’d like to be like everyone else. […] I don’t want to go to a special school or be in a unit. I want homework and detentions. Like ordinary children. (Levinson and Thompson 2016, 38)

YP’s accounts juxtaposed their new sense of inclusion and belonging, attributed to social and emotional staff support, with their past negative experiences of school exclusion (Corrigan 2014; Gibson 2019; Bakhtiar 2017).

**Post-reintegration regression**

Whilst participants often shared the positive outcomes of reintegration, some alluded to setbacks within the reintegration journey (Bakhtiar 2017), and in some cases, the termination of the mainstream placement through exclusion (Gibson 2019; Perez 2018). Regression was
depicted as a deterioration of behaviour, often attributed to external factors that were perceived to be beyond the YP’s control, including reintegrating before feeling ready to cope with the demands of a mainstream setting (Bakhtiar 2017; Gibson 2019).

**Theme two: factors that support reintegration (facilitators)**

*Stage one: AP support*

**Social and emotional support**

AP was suggested to provide a safe, therapeutic environment, where YP can develop their social interaction and emotional literacy skills necessary to navigate the social context of their future MSSs, through the support and understanding of trusted practitioners (Levinson and Thompson 2019; Perez 2018). Practitioners discussed the role of external professionals providing an individual approach to intervention (Gooding 2014), which was echoed within the YP’s accounts (Gibson 2019). Participants made distinctions between the perceived inflexibility of mainstream, and the nurturing support of the AP setting where staff effectively de-escalated behavioural issues and utilised an empathetic approach in teaching YPs to self-manage their emotional regulation (Levinson and Thompson 2019). YP spoke of the importance of feeling understood and the AP staff taking the time to listen to their stories individually and through group intervention (Gooding 2014). YPs attributed their newfound senses of self-belief to the therapeutic support provided by the AP staff who enabled them to ‘engage with certain psychological processes’ to come to terms with their past school exclusion and move forward to focusing on their future selves (Levinson and Thompson 2019, 38).

**Support for learning development**

In preparing YPs for the learning demands of mainstream school, some staff spoke of the effectiveness of APs providing a flexible curriculum with ‘gentler teaching styles’ (Levinson and Thompson 2019, 37), whilst others placed importance on providing an educational experience that corresponds closely to the experiences and curriculum of mainstream (Armstrong 2017). Practitioners’ views converged on the importance of providing a supportive environment where YP can learn the skills and abilities and, importantly, how to use these independently within their mainstream placements. Across the studies, YPs spoke
about how the nurturing AP environment of small class sizes and high staff ratios, helped close their gaps in learning, particularly literacy (Gibson 2019; Bakhtiar 2017).

Peer support
YP reflected on the supportive, empathetic nature of peers within AP, describing their peer support system as a ‘miniature family’ (Levinson and Thompson 2019, 37).

Beth: the most important thing is that the kids, the teachers they understand me and everyone else and they make me feel happy [...] sometimes it feels privileged just to be treated good.
(Gooding 2014, 91)

Mutual peer mentoring was advocated within AP and YP acknowledged the benefits of talking to YP with similar experiences and needs (Levinson and Thompson 2019; Bakhtiar 2017). Peers were presented as a facilitator to the YPs’ progress within in the AP and for some, an impetus for positive change in their behaviour (Bakhtiar 2017).

Support for YP’s families
Practitioners placed value on the AP supporting families through developing trusting and positive relationships, and through signposting them to external, community support (Gooding 2014).

Anne: [AP staff member] met with my Mum and my sister at the beginning of the year to let her know who my head of year was…. called home regularly, every week – letting her know positives and negatives...
(Gooding 2014, 95)

AP staff aimed to encourage ‘positive family involvement right from the start [of the reintegration process]’ (Armstrong 2017, 128). Close monitoring and regular communication between families and the AP staff was helpful in facilitating connections between the home and school settings, a relationship which was suggested as key in supporting the reintegration process (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Gooding 2014; Bakhtiar 2017).
Stage two: reintegration planning

Active involvement of YP
Practitioners advocated a person-centred approach to reintegration, recognising the value in enabling YP to actively participate in the decision-making processes (Gibson 2019; Armstrong 2017). This factor was highlighted as integral to ‘reducing power imbalances’ (Corrigan 2014, 277) and providing a sense of ‘ownership… [where] the young people feel valued and [wish to] engage’ (Armstrong 2017, 134). Practitioners discussed the importance of providing YP with a sense of agency and assigning them a ‘champion’ to elicit and promote their views (Corrigan 2014). Drawing upon the YP’s self-knowledge of their own strengths and needs enabled staff to create a specific reintegration package of personalised support (Armstrong 2017).

Readiness and reintegration flexibility
Practitioners reported reintegration readiness needed to be judged on an individual basis (Levinson and Thompson 2019) through assessing changes within YPs’ self-perceptions:

Leon: […] I didn’t have to be there anymore because I was getting better. I wasn’t getting angry, I wasn’t running around, like running away and like I used to. (Gibson 2019, 115)

YPs reflected on reaching a point where they had achieved their desired levels of progress in the AP and felt ready to embrace the challenges of mainstream (Bakhtiar 2017; Gibson 2019). Stakeholders outlined reintegration planning often required flexibility in terms of timings and pace, aiming to identify a ‘window of opportunity’ for the YP to commence their MSS placement (Levinson and Thompson 2019, 31). This notion was particularly critical given the suggested correlation between length of AP placement and a reluctance to reintegrate (Levinson and Thompson 2019). Some YP felt a gradual approach to reintegration created ‘less pressure’ (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, 345), and staff found easing YP into their new MSS, beginning with their preferred lessons, could increase the likelihood of reintegration success (Armstrong 2017).

Clear, positive, and realistic expectations
Practitioners placed importance on having an agreed set of clear expectations between stakeholders that encompassed commitment to reintegration success (Armstrong 2017; Perez 2018). YP spoke about a desire to succeed in their reintegration and achieve positive outcomes that enable them to accomplish their future ambitions (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Gibson 2019). Participants further highlighted value in having clarification of roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and expectations of mainstream support for YP and their families (Armstrong 2017). Practitioners spoke of the importance of MSSs adapting to more realistic behavioural expectations given the needs and backgrounds of the reintegrating YP (Levinson and Thompson 2019).

Collaboration and information sharing

Practitioners frequently documented the importance of bridging the gap between AP and mainstream settings. Information sharing between settings allowed effective teaching strategies and interventions (used within AP) to be replicated within the mainstream environment (Armstrong 2017). YPs similarly recognised the value of staff utilising their understanding of a YP’s strengths and needs to allow them to provide effective support, ‘particularly in relation to learning’ (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, 345).

Person-centred reintegration planning was deemed essential in promoting effective information sharing and ‘encouraged [the] bringing together [of] multiple perspectives’ (Corrigan 2014, 276). Collaboration with external agencies was further highlighted as a factor in supporting the planning process and in forming shared goals (Armstrong 2017).

*Stage three: reintegration and MSS support*

Reintegration as a fresh start

At this stage of the reintegration journey, participants highlighted the importance of the MSS placements providing a genuine ‘fresh start’ for YP (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Armstrong 2017; Bakhtair 2017). Reintegration accounts stressed the necessity of MSSs providing opportunities for success and receiving YP without pre-conceived judgements. Practitioners emphasised the importance of conveying a welcoming attitude and inclusive ethos to the YPs and their families (Armstrong 2017).
A fresh start – it is important not to disregard the progress made at the PRU or set the student up to fail
(AP Behaviour and Learning Practitioner) (Armstrong 2017, 135)

Parents reflected on their YP having ‘moved on’ (Corrigan 2014, 281) and reintegration signalling a move away from previous negative educational experiences (Atkinson and Rowley 2019). YPs spoke of a fresh start in relation to forming peer relationships and developing a sense of belonging (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, Gibson 2019, Armstrong 2017), which offered a resolution to their previous school exclusion (Bakhtiar 2017).

Learning intervention and support
Practitioners placed importance on MSS staff having a comprehensive understanding the YP’s strengths and needs to appropriately plan, differentiate, and review support (Perez 2018, 91) as well as flexible delivery of the mainstream curriculum (Armstrong 2017). YPs valued social and emotional support; individual, behaviour management techniques; and therapeutic approaches (Gooding 2014); although were resistant to support that would make them appear ‘too different [to their peers]’ (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, 344). These YPs advocated the use of discreet support (including access to a nurture space, student support hub, time-out card) (Gibson 2019); and peer mentoring initiatives that supported their engagement with learning (Bakhtiar 2017).

Staff and family relationships
Successful reintegration experiences were consistently attributed to trusting staff relationships, which allowed the YP to feel valued, listened to, and understood (Gibson 2019, Armstrong 2017, Bakhtiar 2017). YPs benefited from having a single designated keyworker who could provide and coordinate academic and emotional support (Atkinson and Rowley 2019; Levinson and Thompson 2019; Armstrong 2017). Staff advocated relationships that communicated positive regard (Gooding 2014), allowing YP to ‘feel wanted and supported’ (Atkinson and Rowley 2019, 345) and independent, cautioning against them developing an ‘overreliance on the key worker’ (Armstrong 2017, 67).

Anne: I was more calm and they wanted to know why and I said because I had a teacher who understood me and ... who didn’t judge me
Familial relationships were also viewed as facilitative of reintegration. YPs with supportive families provided them with vital encouragement (Atkinson and Rowley 2019), and support should they experience regression (Bakhtiar 2017). For YPs who did not have home support readily available, mediation was found useful in providing families with strategies to allow them to support their YP at home (Gooding 2014).

**Theme three: factors that limit reintegration success (barriers)**

*Stage one: AP support*

Overlooked impact of exclusion  
Practitioners highlighted the importance of supporting YPs in understanding their previous school exclusions in ameliorating the potentially adverse social, emotional, and academic impact (Levinson and Thompson 2016). Without support, YPs were found to hold deep-rooted, negative self-perceptions (Gibson 2019) that posed a potential barrier to reintegration. Exclusion and previous adverse experiences seemed to give rise to the destruction of the YP’s trust in the fairness of the education system, that may be further entrenched by behavioural management strategies that prompt rather than discourage negative behaviour (Gooding 2014).

Lack of family support  
The studies noted the prevalence of YP with backgrounds characterised by family instability and turbulent home environments; which practitioners reported could beget YPs’ disengagement with the reintegration process and educational settings (Gooding 2014). Practitioners reflected on their roles in teaching YPs ‘how to take responsibility for their actions’ and developing skills that strengthen their resilience (Perez 2018, 91) and reduce learned helplessness (Levinson and Thompson 2016; Perez 2018). Practitioners presented the absence of family support as a dual barrier of reintegration in highlighting how unrealistic family expectations could also hinder the reintegration process (Armstrong 2017).
Stage two: reintegration planning

Lack of collaborative working
Multi-agency staff reported limited opportunities for collaboration and felt that ‘not crossing over into other areas [of the YPs’ lives]’ during the reintegration planning process, weakened the prospect of reintegration success (Corrigan 2014, 277). As well as emphasising the importance of parental involvement (Levinson and Thompson 2019), practitioners valued the continued collaboration between settings in maintaining contact with the YPs post-reintegration.

Once a student leaves us, we don’t see them again. The only time you hear about them is when they have failed. If we continued to work with them, then maybe this wouldn’t happen
(AP Behaviour and Learning Practitioner) (Armstrong 2017, 129-30)

In continuing their involvement, AP practitioners promoted their role in providing ongoing consultation and in-school support for the MSS staff (Armstrong 2017; Perez 2018).

Insufficient reintegration readiness
Within the studies, YPs reflected on having a limited sense of agency particularly in decisions made regarding their readiness for reintegration.

Ovuey: I just knew I wasn’t ready. I don’t know what ready was, but I just knew I wasn’t… I got told I was ready and I wasn’t.
(Gibson 2019, 106-7)

YPs who were reintegrated before feeling ready to manage mainstream demands reflected upon deliberately sabotaging their MSS placements (Levinson and Thompson 2019). They deemed transparency and effective communication as essential enablers to psychologically preparing themselves for their reintegration (Gibson 2019). Studies stressed the importance of acting on the views of YP within the planning process, and found failing to facilitate YPs in expressing their views could hinder reintegration success (Corrigan 2014).
Stage three: reintegration and MSS support

Lack of support and understanding
A lack of appropriate support for the reintegrating YPs was commonly reported as a significant barrier, often associated with a lack of understanding and knowledge of appropriate strategies to support the YP’s often complex needs and behaviours (Perez 2018). YPs experienced difficulties in adjusting to the mainstream environment and classroom demands, when the required social, emotional, and learning interventions were not in place.

Beth: In the report, they said they couldn’t handle me, [they] didn’t want me in the school...
(Gooding 2014, 79)

YPs’ reintegration experiences characterised with punishment rather than support were found to result in post-reintegration regression and failed placements (Gooding 2014). AP staff reported they were unconvinced that the nurturing, therapeutic, AP approaches were being replicated within the MSSs (Levinson and Thompson 2019). For some YPs, this notion was analogous to their expectations and experiences of reintegration which they perceived to contrast to the flexibility of AP (Gibson 2019).

Lack of staff training and instability of staffing
Some MSS staff attributed feeling overwhelmed within the reintegration process to: a lack of professional development; inadequate intervention planning time; and lack of opportunities to share knowledge (Perez 2018). Practitioners advocated the need for improved between setting communication (Armstrong 2017), strong structures, and established relationships (Levinson and Thompson 2016), posing instability of staffing and leadership as a potential threat to the reintegration planning process (Levinson and Thompson 2016).

Rejection and relational difficulties
Some YPs’ reintegration experiences were characterised by feelings of rejection arising from difficulty integrating with peers and staff within their new school (Perez 2018; Gooding 2014). YPs who reported feeling a greater sense of belonging to the AP setting (Gibson 2019) conveyed distrust of the mainstream staff:
Beth: There was a teacher I talked to a bit but I couldn’t tell her everything as I did not feel safe to share things.  
(Gooding 2014, 89)

Comparisons were made between the AP staff using playful interactions and talking to the YPs as adults, and the perceived disrespect from MSS staff (Gibson 2019). Some practitioners ranked peer support systems as low when considering factors that support reintegration (Armstrong 2017), and peer disputes and bullying were identified by YPs as contributing factors to feelings of rejection and low self-esteem (Gooding 2014).

**Discussion and implications for practice**

The facilitators and barriers identified within the included studies of this SLR were found to relate to three specific stages of the reintegration process: AP support; reintegration planning; reintegration and MSS support. Findings from the thematic synthesis were configured into a chronological reintegration journey model (displayed in Figure 1 below). This model presents factors to be considered by educational practitioners involved in stages of the reintegration journeys of YP. The particular appeal of the model is its flexibility and non-recursive nature. It presents stages rather than phases of the reintegration journey that are linked to the YP’s location of placement. The absence of an accompanying fixed chronology allows for accommodation of individual need within and between the stages, without fixed endpoints.
Figure 1. Model of a reintegration journey and key.

**Stage one: AP support**
The findings demonstrate that AP marks the first stage of the reintegration journey which provides YPs with a welcomed contrast to previous educational experiences, often characterised by adversity and instability. Stakeholders were found to present AP settings as unique spaces that provide excluded YPs with new beginnings through systemic support within their learning and home environment (Gooding, 2014; Bakhtiar, 2017). Wider literature has evidenced APs recognising the significance of nurturing pedagogies in supporting the complex needs of YPs (Velasquez et al. 2013). This review highlights the barriers to progression to the next stage of the reintegration journey, taking notice of the potentially detrimental impact of overlooking the harmful effects of previous school exclusion(s) and/ or of providing inadequate familial support. Notably, other research has shown excluded YP require benevolent authority and empathic limit-setting within a stable environment (Razer 2018). In this review, staff and external agency support for families was promoted as an enabling factor, corresponding to the earlier reintegration research that identified parental support (facilitated by AP staff) as a significant predictor of reintegration success (Lawrence 2011). The review further identified peer mentoring initiatives as a supporting factor at the AP stage in facilitating engagement within the process, although documented potential challenges for YP with communication and interaction difficulties in forming peer relationships as evidenced within wider research (Hart 2013). The review advocates the role of AP practitioners in preparing YP for mainstream through employing an engaging, personalised curriculum that supports their social, emotional, and learning development.

**Stage two: reintegration planning**

This review presents reintegration planning as a distinct, and essential stage of the reintegration process that bridges the YP’s AP and MSS placements. Findings characterise effective reintegration practice as person-centred, flexible, and collaborative, and identified inaccurate judgements of ‘reintegration readiness’ as potential barriers to success. Reintegration readiness was identified within the context of this review as a broader, contextualised process, rather than a personal attribute of YPs. In promoting the active involvement of YPs within the decision-making process, this approach was suggested to facilitate reintegration through enabling their preparation for mainstream. These findings are congruent with wider research that found employing a multi-faceted, person-centred review
model of intervention was effective in significantly increasing YPs’ self-determination (Hagner et al. 2012). The reviewed studies stress the importance of stakeholders working towards realistic expectations and positive outcomes, echoing the findings of the Managed Move literature that emphasises the significance of reintegration placements symbolising hope for YPs and their families, providing a clear demarcation from previous adverse educational experiences (Embeita 2019).

**Stage three: reintegration and MSS support**

Reintegration accounts demonstrate the need for YPs’ MSS experiences to align with agreed expectations, to promote trust and engagement between stakeholders. As well as tangible support, participants promoted the need for practitioners to reflect on their settings’ ethos and how this is conveyed to YPs. The findings suggest reintegration should communicate a clear pathway towards positive outcomes through learning, social, and emotional intervention. YP particularly supported the implementation of discreet, individualised support and positive regard in facilitating a fresh start. Practitioners highlighted YPs’ relational difficulties as a potential barrier that can be overcome through the dependability of a knowledgeable and stable staff team. Parallels can be drawn between these findings and the commitment from caregivers to their foster children outlined with attachment and foster care research (Dozier 2005). Stakeholders within the reviewed studies advocated the promotion of their commitment to YP in rebuilding the trust in practitioners and the education system, impacted by their previous school exclusion. Enabling YPs to experience a sense of belonging within their setting and develop meaningful relationships with staff and peers was crucial in buffering against the risk of post-reintegration regression, and a key facilitating factor in reintegration success. Familial support (provided or mediated by staff or external agencies) and peer support systems were further found to function as protective mechanisms for YPs, echoing wider research (Hart 2013). Markedly, some stakeholders spoke of social factors hindering the success of reintegration through contributing to feelings of rejection and exacerbating relational difficulties. The variability of reintegration accounts highlights the uniqueness of the YP’s experiences, endorsing an individualised approach to reintegration support.
Limitations of this review and recommendations for future research

This review offers a comprehensive understanding of what is already known about reintegration practices through bringing together multiple stakeholder perspectives from a variety of data sources. It synthesises the findings within the proposed chronological reintegration journey model that outlines the facilitating and limiting factors at each stage of the YP’s journey, which can serve as a framework for practitioners involved within the reintegration process. ‘Reintegration readiness’ was highlighted as a key facilitating factor within reintegration practice, crucially positioned as a person-centred, contextualised process. Empirical research which explores how YPs and school context readiness for reintegration are understood in practice by stakeholders will further contribute to the development of an evidence base for best practice to promote the successful reintegration of YP.

The SLR found wide variability in the methodological quality of the reintegration literature, producing a relatively low number of good quality studies. Three out of the eight included studies were of low methodological quality and contained weaknesses in research design, data collection, and reflexivity. The mixed methodology studies were also found to have methodological weaknesses regarding quantitative data collection and interpretation. As well as highlighting the need for more robust research methods, further research would be best focused on gathering multiple, integrated perspectives of reintegration practice from YPs, parents, practitioners, and peers. The review findings here include studies with some participants who were not the main focus of this review, being either primary aged (Corrigan 2014); partially reintegrated (Perez 2018); still in AP (Gooding 2014); or previously suspended but not excluded (Perez 2018). One study also included data supplemented by research that took place over a two-year period (2012–2014) during the period of educational reform (Levinson and Thompson 2016). Where possible, the researcher has endeavoured to disregard study data associated with such participants, though acknowledge that their presence within the review data may have affected to some degree the reliability of findings.

The SLR process additionally highlighted the need for research to provide a comprehensive set of participant details, particularly regarding the educational background of YP. Studies that lacked clarity around the nature of the YP’s exclusion and reintegration were found to have reduced transferability of findings (Gooding 2014). Further research that provides this context is needed given the evidenced differences in exclusion and reintegration
experiences and outcomes between primary and secondary age YPs (DfE 2019b). In focusing on the reintegration of YPs to MSS, this review has explored a specific, yet important area given the rising number of secondary exclusions occurring within the stage of education that represents a pivotal gateway for YPs’ transition to further education, employment, and training (DfE 2021). As well as collecting triangulated data, it would be beneficial for the research base in this area to gain a wider picture of reintegration practices using larger scale data gathering methods, and longitudinal or retrospective methods to explore the long-term outcomes of reintegration and future destinations of these YPs.

Extending the systematic search internationally opened the review to explore wider, potentially transferable facilitative factors to UK reintegration practices. Whilst every effort was made to broaden the scope to include international research, only one study was deemed to meet the inclusion criteria, raising this as a potential limitation of the review. Whilst this may indicate lesser priority to reintegration practices and/or research in other English-speaking countries, this could also denote a variance in terminology, with non-UK research discussing these practices in terms of inclusion (as in Perez 2018) rather than reintegration. Had resources permitted, an extension of the search terminology may have identified further non-UK reintegration research. Alternatively, the lack of international research may indicate a lessened academic interest in reintegration outside of the UK due to differences in education systems, or the findings may reflect a fragmentation via systems of state governance within non-UK countries. Furthermore, while the rationale for the focus on UK research after 2014 is clear and justifiable, it is acknowledged that the search period could have been extended for the international research to a longer, and more standard time-period, due to this literature not being subject to the same changes in UK legislation. The authors anticipated a more equal balance of reintegration research from other English-speaking countries (US, Canada, Australia) and suggest an international collaboration may be beneficial to comprehensively inform the international picture in relation to student exclusion and reintegration.

**Acknowledgement**

This project was funded through England’s Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) ITEP award 2019.
References


Taylor, E. 2019. “Exploring Perceptions of Enablers and Barriers to Positive Outcomes in a Primary Pupil Referral Unit; the Perspectives of Pupils, Primary Caregivers, and Staff.” Doctoral diss., University College London.


*Paper Two: Exploring the journey of young persons from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).*

Prepared for in accordance with the author guidelines for submission to Educational Psychology in Practice journal (Appendix 5)
Exploring the journey of young persons from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

Keywords
Mainstream reintegration; alternative provision; exclusion; case study, pupil referral unit

Abstract
This empirical study explores the experiences of young persons reintegrated to a mainstream secondary school (MSS) through alternative provision (AP), following permanent exclusion. The research adopts an exploratory multiple case study methodology to investigate stakeholders’ reintegration experiences, within the local context, through individual
interviews. Preliminary interview data and reintegration documentation were additionally gathered. Case One’s thematic analysis developed a cumulative coding framework that was used for Case Two through the process of constant comparative analysis. Findings from a cross-case synthesis are configured into a ‘reintegration journey’ model of global themes and associated subthemes at each stage of the reintegration journey (before, during, and after the AP placement). This model presents facilitating and limiting factors to be considered by educational practitioners at each stage of a young person’s reintegration journey. The research outlines implications and recommendations for practice and future research.

Introduction

National context of school exclusion

Permanent exclusion continues to be a rising concern within England at both local and national levels, with the Department for Education (DfE) reporting ‘persistent disruptive behaviour’ as the most common reason for exclusions of children and young persons (CYPs3) (DfE, 2021). Exclusion remains an interesting anomaly to legislation that outlines CYPs’ right to education based on equal opportunity (United Nations, 1989), further running in tension with the importance placed upon advocating the views of CYPs and supporting their underlying needs, as enshrined within the special educational needs and disability (SEND) Code of Practice (DfE, 2015). A United Kingdom (UK) government review evidenced variance in exclusion rates between primary and secondary schools that could be explained in the literature by differences in: approaches to teaching and learning, behavioural expectations, and their emphasis on wellbeing and belonging (DfE, 2019). Adverse effects of exclusion upon CYPs’ self-efficacy, self-worth, and sense of belonging have been evidenced within the research, compounding the existing risk factors associated with this vulnerable population (Pirrie et al., 2011). Studies researching the educational trajectories of CYPs, who have experience this ‘most explicit form of rejection’ (Munn & Lloyd, 2005, p.205), have documented a range of associated, long-lasting, negative implications relating to health, educational attainment, and future prospects (Gill et al., 2017).

3 Throughout this paper the terms ‘CYP’, ‘young person (YP)’, ‘pupils’, and ‘students’ will be used interchangeably according to the person’s status as a student or excluded child, and consistent with the terminology used within the referenced sources.
Reintegration practices

AP of permanently excluded CYPs of compulsory school age typically takes the form of pupil referral units (PRUs) (Ofsted, 2007). APs/PRUs are widely used to support CYPs who have been temporarily, permanently, or are at risk of being, excluded from a mainstream school, including those identified with learning difficulties and/or with social, emotional, and mental health needs (SEMH) (DfE, 2017). These temporary, short stay schools ultimately aim to support and prepare students for a timely and successful reintegration to mainstream provision (DfE, 2018a; Visser & Stokes, 2003), a process managed by a local authority’s (LA’s) Fair Access Protocol that serves to be responsible for securing educational placements of these CYPs (DfE, 2012).

A systematic review of the existing reintegration research evidence (Owen et al., 2021) revealed three reintegration outcome areas: aspirations and progress; inclusion and belonging; post-reintegration regression. The review’s proposed chronological ‘reintegration journey’ model outlined facilitating factors and barriers to these reintegration outcomes during three identified stages of the reintegration process: AP support, reintegration planning, and MSS support. In light of documented reintegration failures, including lack of attempted reintegration in some AP settings, government reforms targeting AP outcomes were introduced in the form of the Alternative Provision Innovation Fund (APIF) (DfE, 2018b). The APIF supported two projects focused on enhancing and sustaining reintegration success of secondary-aged CYPs through developing key worker relationships, mentoring CYPs during gradual reintegration, and stakeholder partnerships (MacLeod et al., 2021). The APIF further highlighted the role of LA support services including the educational psychology service (EPS) and child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS), in holistic and bespoke reintegration support (MacLeod et al., 2021).

Reintegration readiness

According to the DfE (2021), previously excluded CYPs in AP are eligible to be referred to a Fair Access Panel (FAP) if they are ‘deemed suitable for mainstream education’ (p.6). Lawrence (2011) found that an assessment of readiness was essential to successful reintegration, arguing CYPs individual needs should be paramount within this process. In exploring this suitability for reintegration, Gibson (2019) found a notion of ‘readiness’ to have a dual meaning, with some CYPs describing their readiness in terms of preparation time within
the PRU, whereas others conceptualised readiness as their ability to cope with anticipated mainstream demands. Whilst some research understood readiness for reintegration to be a trait possessed by CYPs (Hart, 2013), Owen et al. (2021) contextualised reintegration readiness as a broader process, encompassing staffing and resource considerations, within the reintegration planning stage. Solomon & Rogers (2001)’s findings supported the development of CYPs’ motivational and coping strategies in preparation for managing the high expectations and demands of mainstream settings. APIF research further advocated the importance of working with CYPs and their families in building the CYPs’ capacity to manage the change process via the development of coping strategies (MacLeod et al., 2021).

**International context of reintegration**

Research in the United States has documented reductions in expulsion rates, following a move away from exclusionary discipline in favour of alternative educational practices such as positive behavioural interventions (Nowicki, 2018). Successful programmes were reported to have flexible and relevant curricula and an environment where young people feel a sense of belonging and ownership, one that is personal and meaningful to students and where young people have meaningful and personal connections with staff (Smith & Thomson, 2014). Within their review, Owen et al. (2021) surmised that the dearth of international reintegration research could indicate lack of academic international focus, obscuration due to alternative terminologies, or a variation in educational practices and prioritisation of reintegration.

**Rationale and research questions**

This study aims to address the research gap through eliciting the views and experiences of secondary-aged YPs who have reintegrated to mainstream through AP, and those of key stakeholders important to their reintegration journey. The researchers are committed to capturing the views of CYPs experiencing this specific form of reintegration, exploring coping and motivational strategies, and facilitating factors. The study seeks to triangulate stakeholder perspectives, providing insights into the details, contexts, and dynamics of the reintegration process, thereby addressing identified methodological shortcomings of the existing reintegration evidence-base (Owen et al., 2021).

This research was actively commissioned to the host university by a reintegration institution (PRU) in partnership with their local EPS. In particularly valuing the CYPs views as insightful contributions to problem solving (Ingram, 2013), the findings will support the development
of a ‘best practice’ guide for educational practitioners, parents, and EPs, through addressing the following research questions (RQs):

- RQ1: What are barriers to and facilitators of reintegration to mainstream through AP?
- RQ2: How are student and school context ‘readiness’ for reintegration understood in practice?
- RQ3: What coping strategies for YPs and their families are identified at various points in the reintegration process?

**Methodology**

**Design**

Following Owen et al.’s (2021) recommendation for future research to gather multiple, integrated perspectives to acquire holistic understandings of the reintegration journey, an exploratory multiple case study methodology was adopted to investigate stakeholders’ reintegration experiences within the local context. A qualitative design was considered well suited to exploring research questions that “require an extensive and ‘in depth’ description of some social phenomena” (Yin, 2009, p.4). Each case contains three units of analysis (Yin, 2009) that correspond to the study’s research questions (see Figure 2).

In acknowledging the need for case study designs to follow systematic procedures (Yin, 2014), the methodology was evaluated against four criteria: internal validity, construct validity, external validity, and reliability (Yazan, 2015). Internal and construct validity were enhanced within the data collection phase through formulation of a clear research framework and triangulation of multiple perspectives (Yin, 1994, as cited in Gibbert et al., 2008). While qualitative case studies do not allow for statistical generalisation to different populations, they do allow for analytic generalisation from empirical findings to theory (Gibbert et al., 2008). The rigour of the data analysis, established through providing clear and specific description of the process, case study, and school context, supports transferability of findings. The enhanced external validity supports the formation of a comprehensive understanding of reintegration from the findings that can be disseminated across similar contexts.
Figure 2. Units of analysis for individual case studies.

**Participant access and recruitment**

Each case was carefully co-selected with the research commissioners with the aim of obtaining different reintegration experiences (Chmiliar, 2010). Secondary-aged YPs (aged 11-16 years) were chosen as a focus for participant recruitment given the high rates of exclusion with secondary schools and the focus of the research commissioners. Due to participants being hard-to-reach and school settings during the period of research experiencing COVID restrictions and additional workload, a degree of researcher resource had to be dedicated to reinforcing communications (see Appendix 6a-6c for participant information sheets and Appendix 7a-7e for consent forms used for participant recruitment). Two case studies were consequently identified, consisting of interviews with a secondary-aged YPs, their primary caregiver (if consenting), a member of staff from their current MSS and a member of staff from the PRU that they previously attended. Owen et al. (2021) highlight the need for research to provide comprehensive participant details to enhance transferability of findings. Profiles of each YP participant are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education status at time of interview</th>
<th>Details of permanent exclusion</th>
<th>Duration in PRU</th>
<th>Details of reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YP Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Year of Academic Year</td>
<td>Reason Excluded</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Reintegration to MSS</td>
<td>Year of Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Year 11 (end of year)</td>
<td>During Year 9 for a serious one-off breach of behaviour policy</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Reintegration to MSS in Year 11 (spring term)</td>
<td>Year 11 (end of academic year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Year 11 (start of year)</td>
<td>During Year 10 for a serious one-off breach of behaviour policy</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Reintegration to MSS in Year 10 (end of summer term)</td>
<td>Year 11 (start of academic year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. YP participant profiles.

**Data gathering**

YPs’ face-to-face interviews, and parent and staff phone interviews, were conducted by the researcher, who had prior experience of working with YPs with SEMH needs. The interviews were semi-structured to allow for probing and clarifications, a method suited to exploring participant perceptions, particularly with regards to complex or sensitive issues (Barriball & While, 1994). Interviews were first completed with the YP, followed by their caregiver and key MSS practitioner (if consenting), their key PRU practitioner, and education outreach worker (EOW) (if involved at the time of data collection), enabling development of cross-participant perspectives on key events within the YP’s reintegration journey. Whilst it was acknowledged that staff interviews may have highlighted distinctive challenges, triangulation from the YP’s interview was actively sought in considering the likely salience of YPs’ perspectives. This allowed novel insights to be triangulated through the subsequent staff interviews. Scope for the researcher to follow up with the YPs however ensured that any significant insights from the caregiver or staff interviews could, if needs be, be returned to directly with the YP. All participants were asked to reflect on key areas highlighted in the existing research as integral to the journey of reintegration including the: permanent exclusion from the MSS; PRU experience; transition from the PRU to MSS; experience in the MSS; future aspirations. Questions within these areas were tailored to each group of participants, asking the YP and their caregiver to reflect upon, and provide retrospective accounts of, their personal reintegration experiences (see Appendix 8a-8e for interview schedules).

Additionally, to help facilitate the researchers’ understanding, a semi-structured interview with an AP practitioner was conducted, together with gathering of reintegration documentation including FAP referral form, one-page student profile, and the (locally used) Transition Protocol document (TPD), containing details of coordinated support at all stages of
the process, artefacts to be part of data corpus. A research diary was kept as an aid to reflexivity (Nadin & Cassell, 2006), particularly during the data gathering phase. All data were gathered prior to data analysis.

**Ethics**

Ethical approval for the research was granted by the host institution (see Appendix 9). Whilst intending to recruit YPs who are potentially vulnerable members of society, the participant gatekeeper and researchers ensured YPs who had experienced personally significant or potentially sensitive events were not included in the study (see Appendix 10). Every effort was made by the researcher to ensure the interview process did not destabilise the YPs, including: ensuring the YPs had at least one half-term to settle into their MSS; providing interview topics to the participants prior to interviews; avoiding sensitive questioning.

**Data analysis**

Interview data was analysed using the six stages of thematic analysis outlined by Braun and Clarke (2013), an analytical and synthesising strategy used for identifying, evaluating, and reporting themes within qualitative research (Boyatzis, 1998). (See Appendix 11 for an overview of the thematic analysis process). Whilst the researchers adopted an inductive analytic approach, whereby themes were constructed without considering pre-existing theoretical frameworks or ideas (Patton, 2002), it was recognised that ‘researchers cannot free themselves of their theoretical and epistemological commitments, and data are not coded in an epistemological vacuum’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.12). The researchers actively reflected upon how the analysis might have been affected by these influences, particularly given their preliminary research, readings, and professional experiences, contributing to a deductive perspective. The researchers evaluated their representation of emerging themes and employed negative case analysis to search for data anomalies in order to improve credibility and comprehensiveness of the findings. Researcher-participant discussion allowed for the negotiation of meaning and supported gathering a valid representation of participant voice. Data were analysed at both manifest and latent levels, examining the implicit content of the data (Boyatzis, 1998), and underlying conceptualisations of the participants’ perspectives and going beyond the semantic level of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2013), a process facilitated by the researcher diary.
Case One’s analysis developed a cumulative coding framework that was used for Case Two through the process of constant comparative analysis (Boeije, 2002). When generating initial themes, credibility checking with an educational psychology post-graduate researcher, and inter-coder checking between the researcher and researcher’s supervisor, were used to sensitise data analysis. Documentary analysis, using elements of thematic and content analysis (Bowen, 2009, p.28), was undertaken with the reintegration documentation. This analysis was integrated at case level with the analysis of interview data (Farquhar & Michels, 2016).

Findings

The Reintegration Process

The PRU practitioner’s preliminary interview outlined multiple reintegration process phases, structured around the locally used TPD. This document outlines the roles of the PRU, Education Outreach Team (EOT), the excluding mainstream secondary school (EXMSS), and the receiving MSS, at two points: the CYPs transition in to the PRU, and their transition out of the PRU. Following the permanent exclusion notification and investigation of appropriacy, the EOT begin to fulfil the LA’s responsibility to provide the CYP with education which may take the form of a PRU. A meeting between PRU staff, CYP, and their parent/ carer explores the CYP’s needs, proposed provision, and develops a home-school agreement. EOT support the CYP and their family whose engagement in the process can be negatively impacted by the exclusion experience.

The PRU provides a ‘bespoke, comprehensive, phased-in induction process’ (TPD, page 20) involving baseline assessments continually monitored through cycles of assess, plan, do, review. CYPs’ abilities, engagement, behaviour, and gaps with learning, and possible underlying needs are explored within the induction checklist prior to lesson integration. Assessment information is collated into a one-page profile, a living document containing a CYP’s strengths, needs, required support, views, and aspirations. This informs planned support in their selected destinations such as specialist provision, vocational courses, or MSS reintegration. CYPs may be supported via PRU interventions or discreet therapeutic work that develops learning, resilience, identity, and emotional regulation, importantly addressing the impact from the exclusion itself. PRU attendance and the CYP’s ability to manage the demands...
of the classroom and learning contributes towards determining reintegration readiness, presented as a recommendation discussed collaboratively with the CYP and their family. With the agreement of stakeholders, the CYP is discussed by the FAP, where an appropriate educational placement place is arranged with the MSS representative. All stakeholders coordinate reintegration pace, timings, and preparatory work, within the initial MSS admission meeting. PRU contact with the CYP typically ceases when they are taken off roll, with support then provided by the EOT and the MSS. No formal methods are currently employed to evaluate reintegration processes.

The main findings sections will present a detailed overview of case studies including global themes and associated sub-themes (underlined within the text), and thematic maps (see Figure 3 and 4); leading to a discussion the overarching commonalities and differences.

**Case Study One: Emma’s reintegration**

![Thematic map for Case Study One](image)

**Theme 1: Experiences of EXMSS**

**Inclusion**

Emma outlined her learning and SEMH needs, and elements of **SEN support** provided by the EXMSS. Assigned staff supported Emma in accessing learning content while emotional support was offered through informal, emotional staff check-ins.
Positive experiences with certain members of senior level staff, with whom Emma had a trusting relationship, were discussed by Emma as facilitators to her inclusion. The PRU practitioner reflected on drawing out positives within Emma’s EXMSS experience to inform the building of positive staff relationships, facilitating their engagement within the reintegration process.

Exclusion

Emma’s EXMSS experience was dominated by a lack of SEN support for her learning, attentional, and social needs, alluding to either the approachability or availability of staff. This account was maintained by the PRU practitioner who described Emma’s disappointment at undelivered or inadequate SEN support, although noted that a YP’s recollection of support can be obscured by their negative experiences. The PRU practitioner explained how an accumulation of these unmet needs and reported bullying experiences reached a level of crisis that instigated events leading to her permanent exclusion. Emma externalised responsibility of these events to peer disputes and lack of staff support.

Participants alluded to the EXMSS’s ineffective behaviour management of Emma’s peers which affected her ability to manage classroom demands. The PRU practitioner outlined how Emma’s difficulties were communicated through disruptive behaviour, yet these were met with reactive sanctions leading to inclusion, rather than support.

Theme 2: Interim Education

Facilitators

The interim period between the permanent exclusion and PRU transition, was an important stage of Emma’s journey where she received positive educational support from a LA appointed tutor. She described the tutor’s nurturing approach as facilitative of her re-engagement.

Emma spoke positively of having a PRU introductory meeting prior to starting her PRU placement. This enabled her to familiarise herself with the setting and staff, supporting her transition.

Barriers
The PRU practitioner’s account highlighted the significant **negative impact of the permanent exclusion**. They explained how Emma had ‘internalised’ (PRU practitioner) the exclusion as a rejection of her identity, which reinforced her negative self-narrative.

**Theme 3: PRU**

**Facilitators**

Participants spoke about the perseverance of staff in **re-engaging the YP within education**. Emma’s account alluded to the staff’s instillation of belief in her potential for reintegration success, alongside developing positive, trusting relationships through inclusion. Staff embodied a mentoring role in supporting identity development, through building her confidence, skills, and interests, as well as providing learning and emotional support within lessons.

Emma highlighted the flexibility of The PRU regarding honorific titles and uniform, in facilitating the **balancing of power dynamics** between staff and YPs, as well as providing a further avenue for Emma to express her identity.

**Identifying and supporting SEN** through targeted, data-driven assessment was outlined by the PRU practitioner as a pivotal phase, and a collaborative process with Emma:

> ‘So what we needed to do really was work with her, like we do with a lot of our students...on...the core issue, why she...was...communicating with her behaviour in this way.’  (PRU practitioner)

PRU staff recognised the necessity to ‘peel back the layers of the onion’ (PRU practitioner), to establish Emma’s learning, attentional, and emotional regulation needs, and explored underlying familial and identity factors. The PRU practitioner reflected on how these unaddressed needs were likely to have contributed to the behavioural presentation that ultimately led to Emma’s permanent exclusion; assessment informed intervention and planning of individualised curricula and targeted support to address these needs and gaps in learning.

PRU staff played an important role in **facilitating parental support** for the reintegration. The PRU practitioner advocated well-planned home-school communication that avoided exacerbating anxieties and negativity, that could be transferred to YPs. Building the family’s
confidence in the YP’s ability to succeed and progress, was suggested to facilitate their ability and confidence in supporting Emma through the reintegration journey.

**Barriers**

Familial difficulties in accepting identities, cultures, and needs, were presented as a significant obstacle for PRU staff to overcome. Parental negativity emerging from a lack of understanding of Emma’s underlying emotional needs and behaviours, developed concerns around Emma’s ability to reintegrate.

‘I don’t think her mum understood [Emma], she loved her very much, but [...] she didn’t see why she couldn’t just...knuckle down and get back out into mainstream school. [...] we had to take mum on that journey with us as well’ (PRU practitioner)

**Theme 4: Reintegration Planning**

**Facilitators**

Participants supported a person-centred reintegration planning meeting whereby Emma’s views were communicated via the support of PRU staff. A graduated reintegration with a reduced curriculum, and timetabled emotional, learning, and social support was agreed by stakeholders within the meeting. Emma highlighted the importance of this placement providing her with a fresh start.

‘it’s all about contextualising it and making it apply so that she understands what it means to her, rather than it just be words on a bit of paper’. (PRU practitioner)

The person-centred nature was also visible within the FAP meeting, whereby the PRU practitioner successfully advocated Emma’s desire for a placement at her first-choice school.

‘it’s that kind of advance networking that means that when it gets to FAP...you know, it’s much more of a straightforward decision and...basically doesn’t feel like the student’s on trial...’ (PRU practitioner)

The PRU practitioner stressed the importance of transparent collaboration between stakeholders in ensuring a sound understanding of the reintegration process and realistic expectations. The PRU’s one-page profile, importantly created in collaboration with Emma, functioned as the primary medium of honest communication between stakeholders.
‘[it’s] really key to be honest that the school gets...who it is that we’re sending them and that we’re as honest with the school as we possibly can be...about what they need and what problems they’re going to face otherwise the child...won’t succeed’. (PRU practitioner)

Readiness for reintegration was conceptualised by Emma in terms of her practical readiness for reintegration, for instance through correct uniform. Readiness was carefully assessed and monitored by PRU staff via a positive behaviour support system which considered Emma’s need for learning, emotional, and social support, as well as her attendance and engagement. The PRU practitioner emphasised the importance of a clear PRU ending, saying goodbye and celebrating her progress, consolidating her positive PRU experience and providing her with closure to move forward.

Emma’s clear career aspirations, developed within the support of PRU staff, facilitated her motivation to re integrate:

‘that made me happy. I knew I could try and do better.’ (Emma)

The PRU practitioner outlined how Emma securing a first choice MSS placement was particularly facilitative of her dedication to the reintegration, academic achievements, and development of positive peer relationships.

**Barriers**

Emma suggested her positive PRU experiences and strong staff relationships, created feelings of reintegration ambivalence. The limitations of the MSS curricula were discussed, in relation to the flexible, personalised PRU curriculum. The PRU practitioner further reflected on how the uncertainty of expectations can lead to reintegration regression as some YPs view PRU support as a protective factor.

The PRU practitioner outlined the length and difficulty of the assessment process. For Emma, her complex needs took time for staff to identify and address using graduated assessment and intervention. While an important part of the reintegration journey, this process delayed reintegration.

*Theme 5: MSS*

*Facilitators*
Positive peer relationships with familiar peers within her MSS classes were found to support Emma’s social integration and positive school experience.

A calm space available within the MSS was outlined by participants as a supportive environment for Emma’s SEN needs, providing time away from the busy mainstream environment. The friendly, nurturing approach of staff was further highlighted as integral to providing SEN support.

The PRU practitioner stressed the importance of carefully managed post-reintegration PRU support through indirect check-ins with Emma via the MSS staff. The PRU practitioner explained how they continue to work collaboratively with the MSS staff, providing them with opportunities to talk through any concerns, without impeding the reintegration.

Barriers
The PRU practitioner presented the YP’s fear of reintegration failure as a hindering factor. Emma required staff to reassure her that she had developed the skills to be able to manage mainstream demands to alleviating her fears of failure.

Both participants raised the impact of COVID within their reintegration accounts. Emma explained how her COVID isolation disrupted her gradual reintegration, access to interventions, familiarisation of the school, and her GCSE exams that were replaced with ‘assessments for each subject’ (Emma). The PRU practitioner outlined how COVID had impacted upon the support of the EOT, who were unable to complete face-to-face meetings which limited their involvement in Emma’s reintegration.

Theme 6: Reintegration outcomes
Both participants outlined the positive reintegration outcomes of Emma’s overwhelmingly successful reintegration journey in terms of stakeholder communication and outcomes. Emma conceptualised the success in terms of the positive outcomes of being able to fulfil her college aspirations. Emma further reflected on successes at different points of the journey, comparing her length of time in the PRU, and the time in which she was able to acclimatise to the MSS, with peers.

See Appendix 12 for quotation extracts from Case Study One, YP (Emma) interview.
**Case Study Two: Ben’s reintegration**

**Figure 4.** Thematic map for Case Study Two.

**Theme 1: Experiences of EXMSS**

**Inclusion**

Ben and the EOW spoke of Ben’s peer relationships that continue to provide him with a connection to his EXMSS.

Ben’s parent described the supportive EXMSS staff, and their efforts in supporting Ben’s substance misuse difficulties. She described how Ben initially engaged with having a relatable role model from this external service, who had experienced similar difficulties and positive outcomes. Positive, nurturing relationships were described with some staff who provided Ben with praise and positivity.

**Exclusion**

Ben and his parent’s EXMSS accounts centred around negative staff relationships, particularly with senior staff.

‘[Ben thought that] they didn’t listen to him, that […] everyone was there to give him a bad time, which I don’t think they were but that’s what he thought…’ (parent)
Ben proposed the EXMSS staff were unreasonable in their sanctions, evidencing an ineffective behavioural management system.

A sense of rejection from the EXMSS was felt by Ben and his parent before and after the exclusion, which was shared with the PRU practitioner who felt Ben perceived the exclusion as a threat to self.

‘he felt rejected...very disappointed and...felt a little bit hard done to and...felt like it wasn’t deserved...I think that’s common with a lot of young people because...obviously...the school is a big part of their identity...’ (PRU practitioner)

This rejection generated a negative emotional response and Ben’s rejection and disengagement of support deemed unsuitable, such as the hypercritical substance misuse support service.

Ben and his parent reflected on the EXMSS staff’s use of reactive sanctions which culminated in the permanent exclusion. The parent noted the constant negative, and sometimes incorrect communication of Ben’s behaviours, which she suggested to be constructive, began to impact upon her ability to work. Ben suggested that being repeatedly placed in isolation impacted on his motivation to engage and attend school.

Ben’s parent discussed his unmet needs, particularly his attentional, impulsivity, and hyperactivity difficulties that she felt were impacting upon his behavioural presentation within the EXMSS. She explained how these needs were not readily recognised and addressed by staff, and although some support was offered in the form transition to a smaller SEN class, she felt these were inappropriate for Ben’s academic ability.

Theme 2: PRU

Facilitators

Building mutual trust was a prominent and complex sub-theme generated from multiple stakeholders. Ben’s lack of trust in education, developed through his negative EXMSS experiences, was highlighted as an important area of focus for PRU staff. The EOW explained that Ben valued opportunities to demonstrate his trustworthiness and independence. Throughout Ben’s reintegration account, it was clear that feeling listened to was critical to the development of his trusting relationships with staff.
‘he’s got a great sense of...justice...though...it was making sure that...everything was equal and fair for him [...] to reassure him that he was listened to [...] that just made it a lot easier for [Ben] to join lessons and keep to routine’. (PRU practitioner)

The PRU practitioner explained how staff eliciting and validating Ben’s views in developing the one-page profile further enabled the equalising of power within the relationship.

All participants reflected on the nurturing, positive behavioural approach of PRU staff, which helped to build Ben’s confidence. Ben’s parent valued The PRU’s focus on positive behaviour and praise which they further reinforced through their regular home-school communication.

Success of this approach can be seen through Ben’s distinctions between receiving detentions in the EXMSS and an absence of sanctions in The PRU. Open communication and active listening alongside the flexible PRU curriculum were suggested as facilitative of Ben’s re-engagement with education, hope for his future, and a significant positive change in his emotional wellbeing.

The PRU practitioner discussed their role in building the family’s trust through reassurance through the reintegration process. Ben’s parent corroborated this account of emotional support and explained how staff helped to alleviate her own feelings of guilt from Ben’s exclusion, enabling her to feel positive about moving forward.

**Theme 3: Reintegration Planning**

**Facilitators**

Stakeholder’s collaborative information sharing was essential at the FAP stage in the determining the suitability of Ben’s MSS placement. Practitioners explained the importance of pre-reintegration information sharing between The PRU and MSS, particularly through the use of a one-page profile, and the pre-reintegration meeting, in which planning of reintegration timings, timetable adaptations, qualification pathways, and additional learning and emotional support was agreed.

...I listened to his questions. I tried to address as many as I could and then I...I took anything that I couldn’t answer and went to school and came back the following meeting with answers for him. (EOW)
The EOW reflected on his role as broker and advocate for Ben in this process, advocating Ben’s voice and facilitating his inclusion whilst building mutual understanding.

A key phase of the planning process entailed PRU staff determining reintegration readiness. Ben and his parent believed this was decided through behavioural improvements and the YP’s engagement.

All participants spoke of the YP’s motivation to reintegrate relating to Ben’s primary goal of achieving qualifications needed for a college apprenticeship to get a lucrative job and comfortable lifestyle following education. This aspiration was heavily influenced by his engagement in the part-time vocational college placement Ben began in his EXMSS, and the praise and encouragement instilled by PRU staff. Participants explained that as The PRU setting was not conducive to learning, this provided further motivation for a prompt reintegration to a MSS that would enable him to achieve his academic goals.

...he didn’t want to leave [The PRU] but he knew that it was in his best interests to...go, he was more capable of being successful somewhere else (PRU practitioner).

This understanding was effectively reinforced by stakeholders who aided Ben in developing his resiliency, self-awareness, engagement in positive behaviour, and motivation to manage his drug use. The narrow window of opportunity to achieve these qualifications, further supported Ben’s reintegration.

‘I knew like I had to do it now or never’ (Ben).

**Barriers**

While the MSS practitioner recalled references to Ben’s previous permanent exclusion within the reintegration planning meeting, they did not consider this to be a barrier, unlike the other stakeholders. The EOW particularly stressed the potential adverse impact the negative reintegration meeting had on Ben’s wish for a fresh start. While there were also inconsistencies regarding reasons for the EOW’s absence from the meeting, there was a consensus that his attendance may have altered the meeting’s reception in shifting the foci towards moving forwards.

Familial ambivalence was voiced within the parent’s account, particularly regarding their projection of reintegration success. She spoke of her previous, and future anticipated,
difficulties in facilitating Ben’s attendance and engagement in education. The EOW reflected on how these concerns could inadvertently influence Ben’s attitude to the reintegration. Fears about Ben’s reintegration outcomes appeared to be compounded by aspects of the reintegration planning that dismissed YP/ family views. The MSS placement was not Ben’s or his parent’s first choice, and they expressed concerns about the distance from their home. The parent and Ben’s account further alluded to their lack of control over decisions on reintegration pace.

Theme 4: MSS

Facilitators

The distance from the EXMSS, was presented as facilitative to the MSS enabling a fresh start for Ben. The MSS practitioner spoke of their role in highlighting to Ben’s parent the advantage of distance from the negative EXMSS peer relationships.

The individualised, flexible timetable and support, collaboratively agreed with Ben, was presented by all stakeholders as facilitative of his reintegration, and ability to access and engage with the GCSE subjects. Ben’s parent spoke of how the EOW resolved timetabling issues and negotiated realistic expectations. For Ben, the timings and format of the school day, with one lesson after lunch, was facilitative of his engagement. Whilst Ben rejected social and emotional intervention, he and the MSS practitioner outlined his engagement with timetabled access to the learning support hub.

Ben and the PRU practitioner spoke of post reintegration PRU support where Ben has taken opportunities to visit The PRU. The strong relationships forged with PRU staff and continued direct check-ins provided Ben with additional emotional support following the reintegration, particularly valuable during reported setbacks. The PRU practitioner emphasised the importance of these visits being formally arranged, and in keeping open communication with the MSS, to avoid creating dependency.

Regular family communication was outlined within the participants’ accounts as facilitative of the Ben’s engagement and in developing a strong school-home relationship. Communication involved the information sharing of reintegration processes, reassurance, and positive feedback, which was particularly important to Ben’s parent.
Nurturing staff and focus on a fresh start were highlighted as an approach integral to Ben’s engagement. The MSS practitioner described Ben’s positive relationship with his form tutor, facilitated through staff recognising the need to identify a positive male role model to succeed Ben’s EOW. Ben’s parent drew parallels with the PRU and MSS staff who supported Ben through positive feedback and encouragement which was further reinforced through the vocational college placement. The EOW identified staff’s perseverance and gentle encouragement to access support, as an important supporting factor.

**Barriers**

Participants highlighted a need for consistent mentor support from the EOW, who reflected on the disruption of COVID impacting upon the success of his involvement. The parent and MSS practitioner raised concerns regarding the withdrawal of EOW support (as per the setup of the EOT service) expressing concerns that the removal of a mentor figure will hinder Ben’s reintegration and college transition. The EOW discussed their hopes to arrange alternative agency support to help minimise the impact of his departure.

The timing and pace of the reintegration was highlighted by all participants (except for the MSS practitioner) as a possible barrier. Participants commented on the benefits of having a gradual reintegration but expressed the view that this was for an inadequate amount of time, and not facilitative of transition to full time mainstream education. Given the small window of opportunity for the reintegration (prior to Year 11) participants mentioned the limited time for preparing Ben for the reintegration. The summer break brought further disruption to Ben’s settling-in period.

The impact of COVID on teaching and learning, and face-to-face contact, and disruption of external support such as EOT was discussed. Periods of isolation for Ben’s class also disrupted his settling-in period, routine, and opportunities for social integration with peers. Ben’s parent explained how reduced educational support in lockdowns impacted on his motivation and emotional wellbeing.

Ben’s lack of social integration within his MSS was mentioned within all participants accounts although only considered as a potential barrier by the MSS practitioner and EOW. The MSS explained how Ben has chosen not to engage with their efforts to develop peer relationships, but instead wished to focus upon obtaining qualifications. The EOW reflected upon Ben’s
perceived differences to his peers who are from a more affluent catchment area, which could have affected his confidence and ability to fully integrate within the school.

Theme 5: Sustained support from EXMSS to MSS

There was an overwhelming sense of appreciation for the outreach support throughout Ben’s journey which was most valued by the MSS practitioner who hoped for this to continue. Work consisted of direct sessions of emotional wellbeing support, target setting and monitoring, family support, advocating Ben’s views, and voicing their own concerns to stakeholders. Having a dependable point of contact supporting Ben from the beginning of his journey (transitioning to The PRU), to post-reintegration, was key in facilitating Ben’s engagement, and the ongoing development and maintenance of mutual understandings.

Having a consistent vocational opportunity, setup by the EXMSS, provided a stable and positive educational experience throughout Ben’s reintegration journey. Ben valued the college staff’s mature treatment of him; the EOW explained how the welding and plastering course has supported his drive to achieve his aspirations, as well as providing some respite to the demands of mainstream education.

Each participant highlighted unclear processes at points throughout the reintegration journey. For the parent, there was a lack of appropriate communication and guidance surrounding the permanent exclusion. Stakeholders’ gaps in reintegration process knowledge were further evidenced, particularly around how YPs are determined ‘ready’ for reintegration, suggesting this is not a collaborative process. The MSS and PRU practitioner’s accounts suggested there was a lack of clarity on the role of the EOW within the reintegration process.

Theme 6: Reintegration outcomes

Participants outlined both positive reintegration outcomes and aspects of reintegration regression within Ben’s reintegration journey. The PRU practitioner and EOW deemed Ben’s reintegration journey to be a success, highlighting his personal progress and the joint working of settings and LA agencies in effectively supporting these outcomes. Attendance inconsistencies, minor behavioural incidents, and a depletion of motivation to engage were however presented as a regression, particularly by the MSS practitioner who outlined their concerns and planned support.
Discussion

Implications for understanding

There was a high degree of commonality of facilitating and hindering factors across the two reintegration cases. Both journeys were synthesised within a complex thematic structure that provided cohesion between the cases, whilst evidencing notable differences. Despite interim support not identified as a distinct stage within the second case, the positive educational experience, and opportunities to ease PRU transition were highlighted as a key facilitator in Case One. The impact of the permanent exclusion was identified within Case One as a hindering factor, yet both case studies considered their PRU experiences as overwhelmingly positive. Both reintegration accounts documented The PRU’s role in supporting YPs’ families through addressing parental concerns which posed as a major barrier to Case One’s reintegration success. Identifying and addressing the YP’s underlying needs was an important element of their support for Case One, alongside specific work on re-engaging the YP in education through an individualised curricula. Case Two similarly achieved this through building mutual trust. Case One’s reintegration planning phase was presented by participants as a positive and collaborative process, in contrast to the negativity experienced by the YP and parent within Case Two. Both YPs (and Case Two’s parent) described their ambivalence towards the reintegration and perceived ‘readiness’, which was supported by a collaborative decision-making process.

Variation between the YPs’ MSS experiences was documented, with Case One’s overwhelmingly positive reintegration experience characterised through the development of strong peer relationships, in contrast to the social isolation that was identified as a barrier within Case Two. COVID disruption featured as a further barrier within both cases that impacted upon reintegration timings, pace, and available support. EOW involvement, and the vocational opportunity afforded to Case Two’s YP, provided an avenue of consistent support, absent from Case One. Both case’s identified positive reintegration outcomes in relation to positive staff relationships, engagement in learning, and multi-agency collaboration. Case Two’s journey however contained aspects of reintegration regression relating to the YP’s depleted motivation and an underdeveloped sense of school belonging. The reintegration journey outcomes of Case One were presented as closer to norm of what could be considered a satisfactory mainstream educational experience.
Implications for practice

Findings from the cross-case synthesis were configured into a reintegration journey model (displayed in Figure 5 below). This model outlines factors to be considered by educational practitioners involved within the multiple stages of the reintegration journeys of YPs, building upon Owen et al.’s (2021) model of a reintegration journey. Facilitating and limiting factors are outlined at each stage, which can strengthen the understandings and support of families, practitioners, and professionals, involved within the reintegration journeys of YPs.

![Figure 5. Reintegration journey model](image)

Consistent reintegration journey support from an external, independent professional who could further provide clear explanation of reintegration processes to stakeholders, is a key addition to the model. Re-engagement efforts were highlighted as providing an avenue of consistent, positive support, as well as stabilising influence for YPs moving through the reintegration journey. The interim period following the PEX is presented as a key opportunity
to mitigate feelings of rejection and educational disengagement with nurturing tutoring support, and to prepare YPs for PRU placements. Efforts to equalise power dynamics were evidenced as an important function of The PRU that enabled the building of mutual trust through active listening and opportunities for developing independence skills. A lack of interim support and limited agency over the MSS placement was suggested to increase YPs’ vulnerability. Findings suggest it would be important for FAPs to consider the YPs prospective sense of belonging in selecting suitable MSS placements. Variation within participant accounts of the reintegration planning stage provide negative evidence of the importance of careful development of mutual understanding between stakeholders.

The findings promote PRU practitioners taking a psychological perspective in identifying and addressing the complexity of the YP’s needs within context. Participants underlined MSS practitioner’s difficulty in meeting the psychological needs of some adolescents through limited knowledge, skills, and capacity. This evidence supports an ecological model of reintegration (Nuttall & Woods, 2013), that addresses the family context, and highlights the need to develop practitioners’ understandings of SEN support, through initial and continued training and supervision from professionals, such as EPs. The importance of a holistic approach to reintegration support further aligns with the APIF research findings that support AP and mainstream partnership (MacLeod et al., 2021).

The research highlighted an interesting dimension relating to the broader concept of reintegration readiness in which collaborative, transparent information sharing enabled YPs, families, and receiving MSSs to be deemed ‘ready’. The findings are analogous to Owen et al.’s (2021) conclusions that reintegration readiness is a ‘broader, conceptualised process’ (p.334) which supports a person-centred review model of intervention (Hagner et al. 2012). The EOW’s role in advocating and brokering the reintegration planning process was suggested to facilitate the building of inter-subjectivities in a structured and gradual way, to prepare stakeholders. A robust cross-case theme about managing YPs’ and familial ambivalence towards the reintegration was evidenced. Approaches, such as motivational interviewing that promote ambivalence as a prerequisite to positive behaviour change (Manuel & Moyers, 2016), may be facilitative of YPs’ engagement with the reintegration process. A need for post-reintegration mentoring support was importantly highlighted. Continued support from PRU practitioners and external EOW offered YPs an independent advocate, welcomed in light of
the busyness of the MSS environment and times of reintegration disruption. This work should be centred upon eliciting and developing YP’s mechanisms for coping, and motivation that drives the YP’s journey, factors evidenced to have a significant influence upon reintegration outcomes. Findings suggest settings would benefit from incorporating methods of continued evaluation of the reintegration process through stakeholder feedback.

Similarities can be drawn between these findings and the commitment from caregivers to their foster children outlined within the adoption and fostering literature (Dozier 2005). Nurturing approaches from staff within the PRU and MSS that are outlined as facilitators within the reintegration journey model similarly advocate the promotion of their commitment to YPs in building their trust and motivation to reintegrate. Fahlberg (2012) highlighted the pivotal role of foster families in providing emotional support to minimise barriers to successful transition from foster care to adoption placements. The absence of adequate exploration and support of reintegration ambivalence was similarly highlighted as potential barriers within the PRU and reintegration planning stages of the model. The adoption literature further identifies links between regression and a lack of continuity of relationships between placement transitions (Fahlberg, 2012), offering support for the sustained and stable support highlighted as a key facilitating factor throughout the reintegration journey model.

**Limitations and recommendations for future research**

Limitations were observed in the differences of the quantity of data between the cases, with a wider range of stakeholder perspectives and subsequent themes gathered within Case Two. A key finding of the research was that the excluded YPs and the parent participant groups were found to be hard-to-reach. The researchers considered a multitude of reasons for this that could include social and familial disempowerment; fear of authority/ consequences of negative information sharing; and negative educational experiences of parent or YPs. Future researchers should endeavour to build relationships with YPs and their families prior to the research, to afford them the best opportunities to participate. Recruitment via gatekeepers from multiple PRUs would provide further opportunities for triangulation and consideration of context and dynamics in an extensively more coherent way.
This empirical research provides a nuanced understanding of YPs’ reintegration journeys from multiple stakeholder experiences. The findings provide a unique contribution to research in considering two very different, multifactorial cases in terms of their history and context. The integrated stories provide a holistic understanding of two different reintegration experiences, creating a more in-depth and informed narrative the reintegration experiences of YPs. Contrasts within common dimensions demonstrate the highly idiographic nature of YPs’ reintegration journeys, establishing a need for more research to explore whether different ‘types’ of reintegration cases can be identified. It is further important to consider that the research findings take a snapshot of each of the cases at different points in the reintegration journey. Case Two highlights rigid barriers, seemingly more apparent given the data was gathered during reintegration challenges. Alternatively, Case One’s post-reintegration viewpoint offered a reflection on the vestiges of barriers from an early point in the YP’s journey, hindering factors that were overcome to make way for positive reintegration outcomes. The different vantage points of the two cases lend an appreciation of the influence of ‘perspective’ upon the reintegration experience, which should be recognised in future research. As these journeys can be considered more or less or differently successful, it will be important from this to develop a more comprehensive and nuanced model of the reintegration journey that considers what constitutes a ‘good enough’ reintegration outcome. A joint understanding of how reintegration success is defined, which is broader than behavioural outcomes, is needed to incorporate realistic expectations and reinforce the successes of a less than perfect reintegration.

Future research should further consider how the different roles of participant practitioners may influence the range of findings. The role of Case One’s PRU practitioner within the SEN assessment process focused on the significance of identifying and addressing SEN, whereas Case Two’s PRU practitioner highlighted the importance of relational factors within their role as the YP’s key worker. EXMSS data was gathered within the case studies that was beyond the scope of the research, yet this was analysed and included within the case findings to provide contextual information to the reintegration journeys. It would be helpful for future research to build upon the inclusion and exclusion EXMSS factors to inform preventative measures, as well as addressing the under-examined impact of exclusion. Recruitment of practitioners also posed difficulties. Whilst senior staff were identified as having the greatest
overview of the reintegration process in their settings, they were found to be the staff with the greatest time availability constraint.
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**Paper Three: The dissemination of evidence to professional practice**
The dissemination of evidence to professional practice

Introduction
This paper comprises four sections that consider the dissemination of evidence to professional practice, in relation to the research of Paper One and Paper Two. The first section considers concepts of evidence-based practice (EBP) and practice-based evidence (PBE) and
related issues. The second section provides an overview of the effective dissemination of research and notions of research impact. The third section contains a summary of research implications for Paper One and Paper Two at three specific levels. The final section outlines the strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination of research from Paper One and Two.

**Psychologists as scientist practitioners**

The role of the psychologist has been conceptualised as that of a ‘scientist-practitioner’ (Lane & Corrie, 2006; Woods & Bond, 2014). Debate and contention surrounding the joining together of science and practice within one model of practice has shifted to a ‘preoccupation with effectiveness and accountability’ (Lane & Corrie, p.2), which substantiates the work of educational psychologists (EPs) within EBP. Lane & Corrie (2006, p.3) identified four core themes as a framework to exploring what it means to be a scientist-practitioner: the ability to think effectively; the ability to develop psychologically grounded formulations that have implications for change; the ability to act effectively in developing intervention; the ability to critique our work in systemic ways. Fallon et al. (2010) present the multitude of roles that EPs adopt within their wider role as scientist-practitioners, utilising their psychological knowledge, skills, and understanding through consultation, assessment, intervention, and training, to support children and young persons (CYPs). Publishing their research has further benefited scientist-practitioner EPs.

**Evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence**

Within the UK, EPs are required to follow the standards outlined by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) to “engage in evidence-based and evidence-informed practice, [and to] evaluate practice systematically and participate in audit procedures” (HCPC, 2015, p.12). According to the American Psychological Association (APA) EBP in psychology is defined as “the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences” (APA, 2006, p.273). Within EBP, a traditional hierarchy of evidence (Scott et al., 2001, cited in Frederickson, 2002) was originally formed whereby several systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were placed at the top of the hierarchy, indicating high credibility, and individual opinion was placed at the lowest point of the hierarchy. The use of RCTs within psychological EBP has received criticism.
for the lack of acknowledgment for the relationships between psychologists and their service users, effectively reducing the effectiveness of the intervention (Fox, 2011). Studies have instead established the importance of research moving from laboratory conditions towards real-life settings, and suggests EPs would be well-suited to conduct such research within the variety of setting in which they work (MacKay, 2007). It is important to note that each level of the hierarchy of evidence (Scott et al., 2001, cited in Frederickson, 2002) can be effectively utilised by EPs. Frederikson (2002) advocated for EBP to be a union of systematic research and professional expertise, for EPs to consider the weight of evidence to determine its relevance. As presented within Paper One, systematic literature reviews (SLRs) provide a means to critically appraise research evidence to inform policy and psychological EBP (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).

Within his model of EBP within educational psychology, O'Hare (2015) outlines four components that should be considered during an informed decision-making process: practitioner expertise and judgment, evidence from the local context, a critical evaluation of the best available research evidence, and the perspectives of those people who might be affected by the decision (adapted from Briner et al., 2009 and Barends et al., 2014 as cited in O'Hare, 2015). Research is supportive of this model being used in EP practice alongside recommended facets that highlight “the interaction of multiple types of evidence that have to be considered critically, conscientiously, judiciously and explicitly” (O'Hare, 2015, p. 205).

Within their doctoral educational psychology training, Trainee EPs (TEPs) develop their research and critical analysis skills to conduct research to support the evolvement of EP practice (Topping & Lauchlan, 2013). A greater focus on EBP has led to the rise of electronic bibliographic databases of peer reviewed research, as utilised within Paper One. These databases facilitate comprehensive searches of studies for literature reviews, reducing potential publication bias (Barkham et al., 2010).

PBE provides a research strategy that allows for systematic evaluation of innovative practice, which has been found to be effectively adopted by particular groups such as TEPs conducting their doctoral research (Barkham et al., 2010). PBE allows for the safe trialing of interventions that integrate professional expertise with service-level parameters (Barkham & Margison, 2007). While RCT studies use a top-down approach that can be initiated by existing evidence and policy, PBE studies are driven by a bottom-up approach, initiated by practitioners.
The HCPC (2015) requirements for EBP, serve to ensure that EPs consistently deliver support to their service users that are safe and appropriate. The complexity of factors requiring consideration within EP involvement however can result in challenges to achieving this aim. Variance in professional expertise in conjunction with EBP and PBE, where the practitioner’s experience is emphasised, can result in variance in outcomes of EP involvement (APA task force, 2006). Fox (2011) reflected upon how EPs can become attached to particular psychological interventions and frameworks which can be confirmed by confirmation bias at the expense of logical validity. Lilienfield et al. (2012) argue that scientific thinking can help to safeguard against bias and errors such as illusory correlation, hindsight bias, and an over-reliance upon heuristics. Under the right conditions for demonstrating causation, reliability, and validity, Miller and Frederickson (2006) present hypothesis testing as successful both within academic psychology, and the idiographic work of EPs.

While EBP supports appropriate, cost-effective, and accountable practice (Raines, 2008), PBE can be considered a better fit to evaluating the evidence of interventions that may operate within an educational psychological service (EPS) and local authority (LA) (Barkham et al., 2010). A new area of scientific interest, ‘implementation science’ has been developed to supports the generalisation of bespoke, local intervention programmes, addressing the gap between the creation of EBP interventions, and their application to real contextual settings (Kelly & Perkins, 2012). Implementation science identifies the components that can support the authentic development of EBP interventions to increase effectiveness (Moir, 2018). This way of thinking supports studies that emphasise the importance of EPs as ‘consumers of the research evidence’ (Reynolds 2011, cited in Lilienfield et al., 2012, p.8), rather than purely the administers of EBP. While the hierarchy of evidence asserts a positivist epistemology (Fox, 2003), the psychological EBP can be argued to be better suited to qualitative research methods that provide an in-depth exploration of the human experience, as acknowledged within this thesis research (Bölte, 2014).

**Effective dissemination of research**

While there is a focus upon EBP and PBE within educational psychology, there can be difficulty in disseminating the knowledge gained from research, into practice. Dissemination has been defined as:
a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in
which research findings are to be received and, where appropriate, communicating
and interacting with wider policy and health service audiences in ways that will
facilitate research uptake in decision-making processes and practice. (Wilson et al.,
2010, p.2).

This definition highlights the importance of different factors influencing dissemination, which
could be considered through adopting a theoretically-informed framework. Within their
research, Wilson et al. (2010) explored studies that had encompassed McGuire’s (2000) five
input variables of persuasive communications: source of communication; the message to be
communicated; the channels of communication; the characteristics of the audience
(receiver); and the setting (destination) in which the communication is received. Of the thirty-
three papers identified as using frameworks for guiding dissemination activities, twenty-eight
employed frameworks that were underpinned by theoretical approaches. A study by
Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) was found to implicitly relate to three of McGuire’s (2000) five
attributes. Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) suggested the utility of considering three levels of
dissemination: dissemination for awareness, dissemination for understanding, and
dissemination for action. The researcher believed that utilising this model would provide a
coherent method of designing and implementing the successful dissemination of the
research. Consequently, practitioners, professionals, and organisations would be able to
access the research, as appropriate. The initial level of dissemination, for awareness, is
concerned with sharing the research with relevant parties that the research benefits, ensuring
they know of its completion. Secondly, dissemination for understanding is aimed at those that
require a greater understanding of the research, in order to implement it appropriately to
improve on current practices. Dissemination for action targets audiences with the
requirement for significant in depth understanding of the research and its intricacies, in order
to achieve wide reaching changes and reform. For dissemination for action, the groups should
be equipped with the skills and knowledge of the research for change to infiltrate practice.

There are various methods of dissemination with the preferred and most common including
publishing research within academic journals and presenting at academic conferences
(Brownson et al., 2018). It has been argued that while these are important methods of
dissemination, there is a need for academic publication to link to the needs and
communication approaches of practitioners (Brownson et al., 2018). Keen and Todres (2007) outline various ways in which researchers can disseminate qualitative research such as an ethnodramas presenting vignettes to inform health practices and an internet database of personal experiences, information, and resources. While publishing research within journal articles can benefit the journal’s readers, employing a wider dissemination strategy that incorporates multiple methods may be of greater benefit to scientist-practitioner EPs. In contrast to research using RCT methodology which indicates a ‘top down’ approach, Barkham & Margison (2007) argue PBE provides a ‘bottom up’ stance to dissemination where the research is derived from practitioners and services. The aim of PBE is to explore ways to disseminate and implement research-based intervention, rather than to generalise the effects of a treatment. Particular methodologies such as action research and co-production, support the dissemination of findings as they emerge throughout the research, providing a means for the continued active process of dissemination (Boswell et al., 2021).

Harmsworth & Turpin (2000) advocate the need for devising suitable mechanisms for evaluating the impact of the dissemination strategy. They acknowledge that for dissemination to be effective, this needs to be an evolving process that changes within constantly developing contexts. Clear objectives should be outlined and reviewed regularly, relating to the five purposes of dissemination: awareness; support and favourability; understanding; involvement; commitment (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000). McVay et al. (2016) suggests a disconnection can exist between what research has demonstrated to be most effective and the interventions that are most utilised. An area of literature called ‘professional learning’ encourages researchers to identify and manage emotions related to the way in which research findings are received. King et al. (2013) consider dissemination to be a two-way process where we learn from research. Hornby et al. (2013) identified barriers to dissemination including educational practitioners’ mistrust of research over their classroom experiences, and a subsequent need to promote the value of EBP to this profession. Studies suggest how research can be hidden within educational policies and services which denies those, who are required to implement the policies, opportunities to shape and evaluate research (Cain & Allan, 2017). These findings highlight effective professional learning and development that promotes the value of EBP as a significant facilitator for dissemination.
Research implications of Paper One and Paper Two

The research reported here consists of a SLR and an empirical study. The SLR, Paper One, synthesised existing literature regarding YPs’ reintegration experiences to a mainstream secondary school (MSS) through alternative provision (AP), following permanent exclusion. The synthesis identified three global themes: outcomes of reintegration; factors that support reintegration (facilitators); factors that limit reintegration success (barriers). Paper One presents the findings within a chronological reintegration journey model that outlines the facilitating and limiting factors at three specific stages of the reintegration process: AP support; reintegration planning; reintegration and MSS support. This model and its implications for practice may benefit practitioners and professionals supporting YPs through their reintegration journey. The paper further outlines implications for future research through identifying a need for research of higher methodological quality, gathering multiple stakeholder perspectives, and addressing reintegration readiness and outcomes.

The empirical study, Paper Two, explores this specific form of reintegration through gathering multiple and integrated stakeholder perspectives. The research adopts an exploratory multiple case study methodology to investigate reintegration experiences, within the local context. Two case studies were identified, consisting of individual interviews with a secondary-aged YP and a member of staff from the PRU that they previously attended, with the addition of interviews with their primary caregiver, a member of staff from their current MSS, and their education outreach worker (EOW) for Case Two. The study builds upon the findings of Paper One, configuring the cross-case synthesis in to a reintegration journey model that presents facilitating and limiting factors to be considered by practitioners at each reintegration stage. Implications are given for future research to build upon the inclusion and exclusion factors to inform preventative measures, as well as addressing the under-examined impact of exclusion.

Papers One and Two present key transferable findings for practitioners who support YPs through reintegration. The findings outline the need to consider an ecological model of reintegration support at the identified four stages of the reintegration journey following permanent school exclusion. Stability of support from an independent professional such as an outreach worker was suggested to be supportive of YPs and families in advocating their voice, facilitating inclusion, and building mutual understandings. Nurturing, positive support
from practitioners within the interim stage, PRU, and MSS placements, was highlighted as key in re-engaging the YPs in education following the exclusion, and supporting transition through their reintegration journey. As within the reintegration planning stage, joint decision making with YPs and their families and opportunities to address feelings of ambivalence was found to be important in effectively determining reintegration readiness. Continued post-reintegration support from MSS and PRU practitioners was further suggested to be facilitative of positive reintegration outcomes. The research findings of Paper One and Paper Two have implications at the research site, organisational level, and professional level.

**Implications for practice at the research site**

The research was discussed with the commissioners within the initial planning stages. The commissioners anticipated this research would inform the existing work of The PRU and LA on averting exclusions, whilst complementing their agenda of developing a system-wide approach to inclusion and embedding this within reintegration practice. Both papers identified facilitators and barriers to reintegration that have the potential to impact upon reintegration practice within The PRU and MSSs involved within the empirical research. Paper One highlighted supporting reintegration factors that can be implemented at the AP level including familial and peer support, and support for the YP’s learning, social and emotional needs. Paper Two builds upon these findings, outlining further facilitators including the building of mutual trust and implementing a nurturing and positive behavioural approach. The importance of The PRU’s role in identifying and addressing YPs’ needs was also highlighted. These findings address the commissioning PRU’s hope for the research to investigate how reintegration success can be increased through the promotion of facilitating factors.

Paper One highlighted implications for APs and MSSs in their role supporting the reintegration planning process through collaborative, information sharing, and realistic expectations. Paper Two echoed the need for the reintegration planning process to be person-centred, considering reintegration readiness and additionally relating to the YP’s motivation to reintegrate. Both papers highlighted the importance of a positive school-home relationship and nurturing staff team who presented the reintegration as an opportunity for a fresh start. Paper Two highlighted staff revisiting the exclusion within the reintegration planning meeting and dismissing YP and family views, as a potential reintegration barrier that would be useful
to feed back to the receiving MSSs. The research findings provide practitioners with a framework for understanding the complexity of factors which impact upon the reintegration journeys of YPs. It would be beneficial for this framework to be disseminated into a best practice guide, with appropriate training given to educational practitioners to support its implementation.

Paper One provided key implications that informed the rationale, aims, and research methodology employed within Paper Two. The empirical study subsequently focused on gathering integrated perspectives from multiple stakeholders involved within the reintegration journeys of YPs. The findings of Paper Two outline further implications for future research into reintegration outcomes, inclusion and exclusion factors, and the impact of exclusion. This work could be carried out in future research commissions with trainee EPs (TEPs) from The University of Manchester (UoM). The TEP completing the research, further reflects upon how the research has impacted upon their own practice, in developing their research skills, interpersonal skills, in how to communicate effectively with a range of stakeholders.

**Implications for practice at the organisational level**

The best practice guide to reintegration practice has implications to all LAs at the wider organisational level. Paper Two highlighted interim support to be a distinct and important stage of a YPs reintegration journey. The effectiveness of support during the period between the YP’s exclusion and PRU placement varied between the two case studies, with a lack of support suggested to be a reintegration barrier. These findings suggest YPs would benefit from LAs putting support in place during this interim stage, to help bridge the gap between exclusion and PRU placement, to support transition and ameliorate the negative impact of the exclusion. There are further implications for the LA’s FAP that includes representatives from their local APs and MSSs. Paper Two found that a YP’s limited agency over their reintegration placement could increase their vulnerability, suggesting it would be important for FAPs to consider the YP’s prospective sense of belonging in selecting suitable MSS placements. The implication for LAs to provide further support and guidance to families and YPs throughout the reintegration journey was highlighted by Paper Two. A vocational college placement for one day a week provided the YP with a sense of stability during times of unpredictability and change. Paper Two further outlined implications for the LA’s EOT’s role,
in highlighting the benefits of having a consistent role model from the start of the YPs journey within their excluding MSS, through to overseeing the YP adjusting to their reintegration placement. The findings on the inclusion and exclusion factors gathered within Paper Two offer further guidance to schools on how they can work to prevent YPs becoming permanently excluded from their MSS. Considering the possibility of all MSSs receiving a reintegrating YP, the research findings help provide these mainstream educators with the preparedness and knowledge of the support and approaches required.

**Implications for practice at the professional level**

Papers One and Two have implications for professionals on a wider, national level. The papers provide recommendations of approaches for addressing reintegration facilitators and barriers that consider the role of EPs. There are implications for how EPs can support the implementation of the reintegration framework through their work with schools and YPs at different stages of their reintegration journeys. With their skills in consultation and role as scientific practitioners, EPs would be well-placed in promoting EBP and approaches recommended within the two papers to educational practitioners. This may encourage educational settings to draw upon local research evidence to inform their practice, particularly in obtaining YPs’ views. The findings from both papers also provide examples and promote the benefits of research that can be commissioned through the DfE’s Initial Training for Educational Psychologists (ITEP) fund. These papers can showcase to educational practitioners and EPs, the availability of, and value, TEPs can contribute to their local knowledge production and dissemination needs.

Paper Two provides implications for professional training for teachers and EPs. EP training currently considers the impact of transition on CYPs, which could be developed to include reintegration of CYPs through AP. As well as the publication of the papers within academic journals that are likely to be read by EP training professionals, the researcher intends to disseminate the findings at EP conferences to reach EPs nationally and internationally. Paper One’s findings particularly drew attention to the benefits of collaborating with international researchers to comprehensively inform the international picture of exclusion and reintegration.

The research papers further identified implications for the DfE’s Alternative Provision Innovation Fund (APIF) research (DfE, 2018). In Paper Two, the researcher highlights how the
research sets a broader context to the APIF research, with both findings converging upon highlighting the benefits of LA support services and stakeholder partnerships. The APIF’s disseminated infographic of factors to support building a bridge between settings adds weight to the findings of Paper One and Two.

**Strategy for dissemination and impact of research**

In devising a specific strategy for dissemination of the research, Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2000) levels of dissemination framework was considered. The first stage considers raising awareness of the research; the second is dissemination of understanding, which considers how the research will be disseminated specifically to particular groups to deepen their understandings; the third is dissemination for action, considering how these groups can be equipped with the skills and knowledge to facilitate change. Table 5 details the existing and future dissemination strategy for the promotion and evaluation of the research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research implications</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Dissemination level (Harmsworth &amp; Turpin, 2000)</th>
<th>Dissemination Activities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Reintegration journey’ model (Paper Two).</td>
<td>Educational practitioners at The PRU</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding</td>
<td>Sharing best practice guide and infographic with PRU staff at team meeting</td>
<td>PRU staff share ‘reintegration model’ with local schools.</td>
<td>Increased practitioner awareness and understanding of factors that support reintegration.</td>
<td>30% increased implementation of reintegration facilitators within MSS reintegrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The importance of managing YPs’ and familial reintegration ambivalence using approaches, such as motivational interviewing (MI) (Paper Two).</strong></td>
<td>EPs</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Presenting research at a conference attended by EPs such as the at the North West Educational Psychology Conference.</td>
<td>Increase EPs understanding of facilitators and barriers to reintegration and how professionals can support reintegration practice.</td>
<td>EPs will discuss with AP and MSS practitioners how they can support reintegration through delivering training or direct work with YP on psychological approaches such as MI.</td>
<td>This could be monitored through a research project with the EPS to explore EPs involvement in reintegration support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSS practitioner’s difficulty in meeting the psychological needs of CYPs through limited knowledge, skills, and capacity. (Paper Two)</strong></td>
<td>EPs</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Presenting research at a conference attended by EPs such as the at the North West Educational Psychology Conference.</td>
<td>Increase EPs understanding of facilitators and barriers to reintegration and how professionals can support reintegration practice.</td>
<td>EPs will discuss with AP and MSS practitioners how they can support reintegration through delivering staff training, on identifying and meeting the needs of reintegrating CYPs.</td>
<td>30% increased implementation of methods to identify and support the SEN of reintegrating CYPs, as observed by professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A chronological ‘reintegration journey’ model (Paper One)</strong></td>
<td>AP and MSS educational practitioners, EPs.</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding</td>
<td>Paper One has been published within the Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties journal both online (July 2021) and in a printed journal issue (September 2021).</td>
<td>Developing practitioner’s and professionals’ awareness and understanding of reintegration facilitators and barriers.</td>
<td>Practitioner’s and professionals will be more aware of and have a greater understanding of reintegration practice and the factors that support its success.</td>
<td>Readers’ correspondence to the researcher (two so far to request a copy of the article to support their research). Journal metrics and altmetrics (currently 412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘Reintegration journey’ model  
(Paper Two) | EPs  
TEPs  
EP trainers | Awareness  
Understanding | Paper Two has been prepared in accordance with the Educational Psychology in Practice publication guidelines, and will be submitted for publication to this journal. | The article will be published and read by readers that are part of the Association for Educational Psychologists.  
Raising awareness amongst the journal’s readers. Once consumed, the research will increase understanding of how EPs can deliver support and training to facilitate reintegration success.  
A subset of readers in relevant roles may go on to include and reference research within current EP training. This will influence and guide conversations within their services and schools, to explore how they can support schools with reintegrating CYPs. | Unsolicited contact to the researchers, journal metrics and altmetrics i.e. number of: views, citations, and shares on social media, as evaluation markers. |
| Promotion of PRU practitioners using a psychological perspective in identifying and addressing SEN, and methods to evaluate the reintegration process through stakeholder feedback. (Paper Two) | AP educational practitioners.  
| Awareness  
Understanding | Presenting research within a seminar at PRUsAP annual conference (an executive team that represent PRUs and APs from regions across the country). | Research will be delivered to a target audience responsible for policies of professional bodies.  
Developing practitioners’ awareness and understanding, informing existing reintegration processes in their settings. | Conference delegates feedback assess understanding. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reintegration readiness is a broader, conceptualised process which supports a person-centred, collaborative, transparent information sharing process (Paper One and Paper Two).</th>
<th>AP educational practitioners.</th>
<th>Awareness Understanding</th>
<th>Presenting research within a seminar at PRUsAP annual conference (an executive team that represent PRUs and APs from regions across the country).</th>
<th>Research will be delivered to a target audience responsible for policies of professional bodies.</th>
<th>Developing practitioners’ awareness and understanding, informing existing reintegration processes in their settings.</th>
<th>Conference delegates feedback assess understanding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A need for post-reintegration mentoring support, and an independent advocate, to elicit and develop YPs mechanisms for coping, and motivation (Paper Two).</td>
<td>AP educational practitioners.</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding</td>
<td>Presenting research within a seminar at PRUsAP annual conference (an executive team that represent PRUs and APs from regions across the country).</td>
<td>Research will be delivered to a target audience responsible for policies of professional bodies.</td>
<td>Developing practitioners’ awareness and understanding, informing existing reintegration processes in their settings.</td>
<td>Conference delegates feedback assess understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited agency over the MSS placement associated with CYPs’ vulnerability and instances of reintegration regression and underdeveloped sense of school belonging (Paper Two). Interim period support following the PEX as an opportunity to mitigate rejection, disengagement, and to prepare</td>
<td>LA professionals and FAP members.</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding Action</td>
<td>Presenting research through a workshop meeting, reviewing current processes and suggested changes.</td>
<td>Meeting will be conducted with people responsible for FAP panel processes.</td>
<td>To inform and change FAP panel processes to consider the YPs prospective sense of belonging in selecting suitable MSS placements, and implementing interim support.</td>
<td>Verbal or written feedback from YPs and families to evaluate sense of belonging, placement preferences, post-PEX and post-reintegration support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variability in the methodological quality of the reintegration literature and recommendations including: gathering multiple, integrated stakeholder perspectives, larger scale, longitudinal and retrospective methods to explore long-term outcomes and destinations, inclusion of participant details, international collaboration (Paper One).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations for future research data gathering with excluded YPs and the parent participant groups identified as ‘hard-to-reach’, including recruitment via gatekeepers from multiple PRUs (Paper Two).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended areas for future research including: different ‘types’ of reintegration, good enough’ reintegration outcomes and success, and inclusion and exclusion EXMSS factors and explore impact of exclusion. (Paper Two)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-EPs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-TEPs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-EP trainers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper Two has been prepared in accordance with the Educational Psychology in Practice publication guidelines, and will be submitted for publication to this journal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The article will be published and read by readers that are part of the Association for Educational Psychologists.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raising awareness amongst the journal’s readers. Once consumed, the research will increase understanding of areas for future research and considerations.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A subset of readers in relevant roles may go on commission or conduct research in the recommended areas.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsolicited contact to the researchers, journal metrics and altmetrics i.e. number of: views, citations, and shares on social media, as evaluation markers.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability in the methodological quality of the reintegration literature and recommendations (Paper One). Considerations for future research data gathering (Paper Two). Recommendation areas for future research (Paper Two).</td>
<td>Research commissioner (EP trainers)</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding Action</td>
<td>Meeting with EP trainers (research commissioners) to discuss commissioning subsequent research to build on findings.</td>
<td>Commissioning research where the researcher supports/ supervises TEPs. Development of present research findings to enrich the understanding of reintegration practice, using robust research methods that are of high methodological quality.</td>
<td>Evaluated through researcher successfully commissioning a research project that is carried out and published within a peer reviewed journal article to add to the existing reintegration evidence base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability of stakeholder understandings, and the importance of mutual understanding and a holistic approach to reintegration planning and support, and consistent role model (Paper Two).</td>
<td>LA professionals</td>
<td>Awareness Understanding Action</td>
<td>Meeting with LA EOW team to present research findings, discuss and implement changes to processes and support.</td>
<td>LA arranging for excluded YPs and their families to have interim support-educational and emotional, before PRU transition, and promote consistent support. Mitigating effects of the exclusion, supporting YPs transition to The PRU and re-engagement in education.</td>
<td>Quicker and more successful re-engagement observed by The PRU staff. Verbal/ written feedback from YPs and families to explore their experiences of the reintegration planning stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 2: Full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria

### Inclusion criteria

1. Research from any nation with abstracts written in English.
2. Research that is empirical and provides primary data.
3. Research focusing on reintegration through alternative provision/ PRUs/ learning centres/ special schools to mainstream secondary school.
4. Research where YP have received a previous permanent or temporary school exclusion.
5. Research where the intention is for permanent, full time reintegration.
6. Research where social, emotional, mental health (SEMH)/ emotional, behavioural disorder (EBD)/ challenging behaviour/ delinquent youth/ Oppositional Defiance Disorder (ODD) is the as the primary need of the YP.
7. Research carried out following the publication of the SEN Code of Practice Draft (October, 2013).

### Exclusion criteria

1. Systematic literature reviews or meta-analyses.
2. Research where social communication/ medical needs are the primary needs of the YP.
3. Research where YP have reintegrated through a hospital/ medical facility/ or secure unit.
4. Research where YP have reintegrated through the manage move process.
Appendix 3: Evaluative frameworks

Appendix 3a: Review framework for qualitative evaluation/investigation research

Educational and Psychology Research Group
Critical Appraisal Review Frameworks

Qualitative Research Framework

The University of Manchester Educational Psychology Critical Appraisal Review Frameworks were first developed in 2011 (Woods, Bond, Humphrey, Symes & Green, 2011). Since then the frameworks have been developed and extended as flexible tools for the critical appraisal of a wide range of qualitative and quantitative research that may be drawn upon by practising psychologists. This 2020 version of the qualitative research framework is designed to support critical appraisal of qualitative research, whether broadly an evaluation or investigation study.

The frameworks have been widely used and adapted in many published systematic reviews of evidence. Recent versions of the qualitative research framework have been used, or adapted for use, in evidence reviews by Akbar & Woods, (2019); Tomlinson, Bond and Hebron (2020); Simpson and Atkinson (2019); and Tyrell and Woods (2018).

If using, or adapting, the current version of this checklist for your own review, cite as:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion/ score</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear aim of research e.g. aim/ goal/ question of the research clearly stated,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance/ utility justified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the research design e.g. rationale vis-à-vis aims, links to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous approaches, limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear sampling rationale e.g. description, justification; attrition evaluated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of data collection method e.g. methods link to research aims,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rationale for method provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well executed data collection e.g. clear details of who, what, where, how;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intended/ actual (if modified) effect of execution on data quality; data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saturation considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis close to the data, e.g. researcher can evaluate fit between categories/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themes and data, participant 'voice' evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of explicit reflexivity e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• impact of researcher (vis-à-vis cultural/ theoretical position; researcher-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant relationship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• limitations identified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• data validation (e.g. inter-coder checks/ peer moderation/ consultation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• researcher philosophy/ stance evaluated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• conflict of interest statement included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative case analysis, e.g. e.g. contrasts/ contradictions/ outliers within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data; categories/ themes as dimensional; diversity of perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation of meanings, e.g. member checking, methods to empowering participants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid conclusions drawn e.g. data presented support the findings which in turn support the conclusions; comparison to previous studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent theory related to the problem, e.g. links to previous findings/ explanation of changes or differences/ abstraction from categories/ themes to model/ explanation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable conclusions e.g. contextualised findings; limitations of scope identified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of attention to ethical issues e.g. presentation, sensitivity, minimising harm, feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of documentation e.g. schedules, transcripts, thematic maps, paper trail for external audit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and coherence of the reporting e.g. clear structure, clear account linked to aims, key points highlighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Max 20</td>
<td>Mean % agree</td>
<td>Mean % agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix 3b: Review framework for quantitative research*
Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology

Critical Appraisal Review Frameworks

Quantitative Research Framework

The University of Manchester Educational Psychology Critical Appraisal Review Frameworks were first developed in 2011 (Woods, Bond, Humphrey, Symes & Green, 2011). Since then the frameworks have been developed and extended as flexible tools for the critical appraisal of a wide range of qualitative and quantitative research that may be drawn upon by practising psychologists. This 2020 version of the quantitative research framework amalgamates previous quantitative frameworks to support critical appraisal of quantitative research, whether broadly an evaluation or investigation study.

The frameworks have been widely used and adapted in many published systematic reviews of evidence. Recent versions of the quantitative research frameworks have been used, or adapted for use, in evidence reviews by Flitcroft and Woods (2018); Simpson and Atkinson (2019); Tomlinson, Bond, & Hebron (2020); Tyrell & Woods (2018).

If using, or adapting, the current version of this checklist for your own review, cite as:

References


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>R 1</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>R 1</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (evaluation studies only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a randomised group design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Comparison with treatment-as-usual or placebo, OR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Comparison with standard control group/ single case experiment design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of manuals/ protocols for intervention/ training for intervention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity checking/ supervision of intervention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear research question or hypothesis e.g. well-defined, measurable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constituent elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate participant sampling e.g. fit to research question,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate measurement instrumentation. e.g. sensitivity/ specificity/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliability/ validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of multiple measures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive data gathering e.g. multiple measures used; context of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurement recorded (e.g. when at school vs at home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate data gathering method used e.g. soundness of administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of bias within participant recruitment/ instrumentation/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration e.g. harder-to-reach facilitation; accessibility of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate/ completion maximised e.g. response rate specified;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piloting; access options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population subgroup data collected e.g. participant gender; age; location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing data analysis</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Level and treatment specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time trends identified</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. year on year changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic considerations</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. regional or subgroup analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate statistical analyses</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(descriptive or inferential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. coherent approach specified;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample size justification/ sample size adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-level or inter-group analyses present</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. comparison between participant groups by relevant location or characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data interpretation**

| Clear criteria for rating of findings | 1 | 0 |
| e.g. benchmarked/ justified evaluation of found quantitative facts |  | |
| Limitations of the research considered in relation to initial aims | 1 | 0 |
| e.g. critique of method; generalizability estimate |  | |
| Implications of findings linked to rationale of research question | 1 | 0 |
| e.g. implications for theory, practice or future research |  | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Mean % agree</th>
<th>Mean % agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (investigation studies) (max=20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (evaluation studies) (max=29)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Descriptive summaries of the studies included in this SLR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year/Country</th>
<th>Aims and/or Research Questions (RQ)</th>
<th>Participants/ Age range/ Setting</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>WoE A</th>
<th>WoE B</th>
<th>WoE C</th>
<th>WoE D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perez (2018) USA    | To examine the successes or failures of EBD (emotionally and behaviourally disturbed) YP in MSS, following transition from special education (SE) settings. | – Six YP with EBD aged 12-14 years.  
– YPs’ parents, general education (GE) teachers, and SE teachers. | Qualitative methodology  
– Questionnaires for YP views of MSS, teacher views of teaching EBD students, parental views.  
– Observations of teachers and YP.  
– Semi-structured interviews: YP, teachers and parents. | – YP’s educational experiences feature: rejection; teachers; feelings.  
– GE teachers need support for: professional development; classroom management; curriculum.  
– SE teachers identify significance of: behaviours; instruction; school culture.  
– GE teachers are subject to demands, though lack adequate support for responsibilities. SE teachers have similar administrative demands, but classroom dynamics differed. | Qual : High (9) | Low | Med |
| Gooding (2014) UK   | To examine the views of excluded YP re. intervention to support readiness for mainstream reintegration. | – Six YP (aged 12-15 years): three YP still at PRU; three reintegrated YP.  
– 17 practitioners: County EPs; MSS and PRU staff. | Mixed methodology  
– Qualitative: Semi-structured interviews with YP.  
– Quantitative: intervention data; questionnaires for EPs, MSS and PRU practitioners. | – YP struggle to cope with challenges (e.g. adolescence, transition); impact of relationships (family, peers, teachers); intervention: reward, punishment, or help.  
– Supportive interventions include a combination of social, emotional, behavioural (SEB) support interventions; behaviour management techniques (BMT).  
– Interventions considered effective at the individual, family, school, and community/ multiagency levels, with observed differences between schools within districts of higher exclusion.  
– MSS staff use SEB support, extensive individual BMT, therapeutic approaches; not consultation and assessment.  
– PRU staff predominantly use: SEB support and BMT; whole school approach; small group work; limited therapeutic interventions suggesting low levels of multi-agency involvement. | Qual : Med (12.75) | Med | Low | Med |
| Atkinson & Rowley (2019) UK | To explore the views of YP re. factors that support their reintegration | – Nine YP, reintegrated through AP following exclusion: three | Mixed methodology  
– Q methodology.  
– Q-set derived from school staff, parents, carers’ questionnaires. | – Two distinct viewpoints for primary and secondary aged YP.  
– YP accounts highlighted facilitating factors: individual (desire to succeed); parental (support; encouragement; relationship (keyworker in school; belief from staff; | Qual : Med (10.75) | Med | Med | Med |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrigan (2014)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>To explore person-centred planning (PCP) in supporting excluded YP reintegrating to MSS; stakeholder views; outcomes.</td>
<td>Mixed methodology &lt;br&gt; YP completed Q-sort.</td>
<td>Stakeholders perceive PCP as useful in facilitating reintegration. &lt;br&gt; Stakeholder accounts identified PCP entails: child-centred approach; positive and hopeful; collaborative planning; understanding of needs. &lt;br&gt; Stakeholders identified facilitators and barriers of PCP to support reintegration. &lt;br&gt; Facilitators: ‘champion’ eliciting YP’s views; ‘facilitator’ co-constructing stakeholder perspectives; collaboration; inclusive school systems; ethos; communication between schools and AP. &lt;br&gt; Barriers: lack of focus on YP’s home environment; poor meeting attendance; lack of information sharing; timescales imposed by LA systems; other factors (changing perceptions of time and capacity).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levinson &amp; Thompson (2016)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>To explore YP and staff’s views re. reasons for being in AP; differences in culture between AP and MSS; feelings re. reintegration.</td>
<td>Qualitative methodology &lt;br&gt; 2015 data: ethnographic interviews for YP (in pairs) &lt;br&gt; 2012-2014 data: semi-structured interviews for teachers and TAs.</td>
<td>Teaching staff identify facilitators and barriers to reintegration: child; family; systems (staff/leadership stability); transition timing (windows of opportunity, importance of flexibility), correlations between time in AP and reintegration reluctance. &lt;br&gt; Teaching staff gave support for an integrated approach to reintegration: strong PRU/MSS relationships, critical presence of a trusted TA. &lt;br&gt; YP’s accounts of their PRU experiences involve: APs constructing supportive environments/ethos (AP as an extended family); empathetic yet assertive staff. &lt;br&gt; YP’s identify problematic contrasts between AP and MSS and highlight suggested areas of changes to MSSs for reintegration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson (2019)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>To explore the reintegration experiences of YP with SEMH needs.</td>
<td>Qualitative methodology &lt;br&gt; Semi-structured interviews for YP.</td>
<td>YP reintegration accounts entail: meanings ascribed to reintegration (learning, reintegration readiness, positive future selves); factors impacting on agency (understanding strengths/needs, control over processes, systemic flexibility); sense of self (positive/negative feelings, change indicators, external)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Armstrong (2017) UK | To explore the perspectives of PRU and MSS staff on the reintegration of YP from a PRU to MSS. | – Two secondary-aged YP, reintegrated through PRU. 
  – PRU and MSS staff, EPs, Trainee EPs, behaviour and learning practitioners, pastoral managers, inclusion officers. | Mixed methodology 
  – Q methodology 
  – Q-set (60 statements) from: online stakeholder questionnaire; staff focus groups (10 PRU, 12 MSS); unstructured interviews: two MSS staff, two YP. 
  – Q-sort pilot study: (two PRU staff, one inclusion officer). 
  – Q-sort completed by staff. 
  – Qualitative questionnaires, interviews with six staff. | – Three distinct viewpoints from PRU and MSS staff: collaborative working; inclusive practice, availability of resources and support (from families and agencies); individualised approaches and the role of the school (personalised, flexible approaches). 
  – Shared perspectives between PRU and MSS staff: collaboration and positive relationships; clarity of goals and expectations; resources. 
  – MSS staff highlight the difficulty in providing a similar small, supported environment to the PRU as barrier to success. 
  – Staff accounts identify barriers to reintegration: communication; understanding; attitudes and expectations; consistency; engagement and support; availability. | Qual: High (17.75) | Med | High | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bakhtiar (2017) UK | To investigate the successful reintegration experiences of YP. | – Two previously excluded YP, reintegrated to MSS (in Years 8/9) through Inclusion Centre. | Qualitative methodology 
  – 2 narrative therapy interviews: interview 1: co-creation of story: mountains with YP; interview 2: ‘I’ Poem (‘I’ quotes interview 1) negotiated/ shared with YP. | – YPs’ reintegration experiences feature: relationships (family, friends, teachers, police); identity (voice, behaviour, image, attitude to learning); learning environment (old school, inclusion centre, new school, environment, aspirations, support). 
  – Accounts support: personalised reintegration plans; authentic relationships and agency; acknowledgment of post-reintegration regression; adoption of a whole school approach. | Qual: High (16.75) | Low | High | Med |
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Appendix 6: Participant Information Sheets

Appendix 6a: Participant Information Sheets – Young Persons

The journey from exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Participant information sheet for young people

Who is conducting the research?

My name is Chynna Owen and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) at the University of Manchester. A TEP means I am learning how to become an Educational Psychologist (EP). An EP is someone who works with lots of young people like you in many different schools and colleges. I would like to invite you to take part in my research study about what it's like to go to a short-stay school (pupil referral unit) after an exclusion, and then to go to a new mainstream school.

Before you decide if you wish to take part, please make sure that you understand:

1. Why the research is being done
2. What your involvement in the project will be

Take your time to read through this information sheet before you decide if you wish to take part. Ask as many questions as you wish.

What is the research and why are we doing it?

The research wants to find out more about the journey that young people go on from being from being excluded from a school, moving to a short-stay school, and then moving to a new mainstream school. We call this the journey of reintegration. There isn’t a lot of studies that have researched this journey and even less that have asked young people who have been on this journey. We’re really interested in speaking to young people to find out about their experiences of reintegration. We also want to speak to parents/ carers and teachers about the reintegration journey of young people. The research wants to understand reintegration better and find out what has been good and not so good about this journey so schools like *insert name of PRU* can learn lessons and know how to make it better.

Why have I been asked to take part?

We have asked you to take part because you have been on this reintegration journey and have attended *insert name of PRU* and then reintegrated to a mainstream secondary school.

What would I be asked to do if I take part?
If you want to take part, you will be asked questions about your experiences of reintegration in what we can an interview. The researcher will show you the questions before the interview so you know what to expect. These questions will ask you about:

- Your experiences in your first school
- Your experiences in the *insert name of PRU*
- Your experiences of moving from *insert name of PRU* to your new school
- Your experiences so far in your new school
- Your hopes and plans for the future

**How long is the study?**

The interview will take no more than 1 hour.

**Where will the study take place?**

The interview will take place in your school during the school day.

**Will my participation in the study be confidential?**

In order to take part in the research we will need to know your:

- Name
- Age
- Gender
- School

Only the research team will have access to your information, and we will ensure it is kept safe and secure. We are keeping this information safe and following data protection law.

The University of Manchester is the Data Controller, which means that we will protect the information about you. All researchers have received training to do this and we will make sure that they keep your information safe.

We will make sure that no one knows you have chosen to take part in the study and will also not share any information you have given to us. To do this we will use a process called anonymising, which means that we will generate a secret code for you and make sure that your name is stored in a different place to the rest of the information you give us. We will also keep the information you give us for 5 years and then it will be safely destroyed.

You have a number of rights under data protection law, including the right to see any of the information you have shared with us. If you would like to know more about your rights or find out the legal reason we collect and use your information, please read through the Privacy Notice for Research or discuss it with your parent/carer.
Whilst unlikely, there is a possibility that the researcher may have to break confidentiality. Examples of this could include if, during the study:

- The researcher has concerns about your safety or the safety of others
- You talk about any wrongdoing
- You disclose information about any current or future illegal activities

If this would happen, the researcher would have to follow the safeguarding policy of your school and tell the designated safeguarding officer.

**Do I have to take part?**

It is completely up to you if you wish to take part in the study. Make sure you think carefully and consider all the information contained in this sheet before you decide. After you have decided you will be asked to sign an assent form that shows you understand and agree to take part in the research. Your parent/carer will do the same (and sign a consent form) if they also agree for you to take part.

**What if I change my mind?**

You are free to withdraw from the study before or during the study without having to give a reason. You are also free to withdraw from the study up to 24 hours after the interview, and your data will not be included in the research. Please remember that your data will be anonymised, and you will not be identified in any way.

**Who is organising and approving the research?**

The research is being commissioned by the University of Manchester, *insert name of PRU*, and *insert name of EPS*. The research has also been approved by UREC, a group of people who work to protect your safety, rights, wellbeing and dignity.

**What do I do now?**

If you have any questions relating to the information contained in this sheet, please let the researcher know:

---

**Researcher:** Chynna Owen  
Email: chynna.owen@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk  
Address: Manchester Institute of Education  
School of Environment, Education and Development  
Ellen Wilkinson Building,  
Oxford Road,  
University of Manchester  
M13 9PL  
Contact number: 0161 275 3511

**Research Supervisor:** Professor Kevin Woods  
Email: kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk  
Address: Manchester Institute of Education  
School of Environment, Education and Development  
Room A5.16 Ellen Wilkinson Building,  
Oxford Road,  
University of Manchester  
M13 9PL  
Contact number: Tel: 0161 275 3509

---

*Thank you for reading this! 😊*
Appendix 6b: Participant Information Sheets – Parents/ Caregivers

The journey from exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Participant Information Sheet (PIS)

You are being invited to take part in a research study which aims to explore the journey of pupils from school exclusion, enrolment at a PRU, to reintegration to a mainstream school. Before you decide whether to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully before deciding whether to take part and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

About the research

➢ Who will conduct the research?

Chynna Owen, a first year Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) at the University of Manchester (UoM).

What is the purpose of the research?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the journey of young people from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). The study intends to recruit participants to form three case studies, making up one multiple case study of reintegration within this local authority (LA). For each case study, the research aims to recruit:

• a young person who has been reintegrated into a mainstream secondary school (MSS);
• their parent or carer;
• a member of staff from the PRU that they attended who knows them well;
• a member of staff from the MSS that they currently attend who has been involved in their reintegration.

Through the use of research interviews, the study wishes to gather the perspectives and experiences of these participants to gain an insight into the processes involved in reintegration and factors that support or act as a barrier to reintegration in practice. I hope to generate themes from the data that will contribute to my course research project.

You have been purposively selected to participate in this study as your child/ young person has recently reintegrated to their new secondary school following attending a PRU. Your participation and valuable insights will hopefully provide me with a greater understanding of reintegration, which aims to inform and improve reintegration within the LA.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

Findings will be written up into a thesis that will be submitted to the University of Manchester as part of the assessment requirements of the Doctorate of Educational and Child Psychology. The
thesis intends to be submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal and the findings may be used in future research.

➢ Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) Check

The data collection will take place within your educational setting. I have undergone an Enhanced DBS check as a Child and Adult Workforce Trainee Educational Psychologist. I will show my enhanced certificate to the school staff on entry.

➢ Who has reviewed the research project?

The project has been reviewed by The School of Environment, Education and Development Ethics Committee at The University of Manchester.

➢ Who is funding the research project?

The project is being funded by the Department for Education Initial Training for Educational Psychologists.

What would my involvement be?

➢ What would I be asked to do if I took part?

A convenient date and time for an interview would then be organised. Before the interview, you would be asked to sign a consent form providing your consent to participate (please see the attached form). The duration of the interview would take no more than an hour and could take place within a room at your child’s school, or over the phone or video call from your home. During the interview you would be asked a series of questions regarding the general processes and your perceptions of the facilitators and barriers of reintegration practice. You will also be asked to reflect upon the journey of your child who has consented to participating in this research and who will be interviewed about their reintegration journey. You will have the right to stop the interview before, during or after the interview, and have your data removed, up until 24 hours after the interview. The interview will be recorded using an audio recorder stored securely. Following the research, a summary of the study will be shared with you.

➢ What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you wish to take part, please send an email to the researcher (contact details at the end of this document) confirming this. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form on the day of the interview (please see attached). The interview will be audio recorded and this is essential to your participation in the study. You should be comfortable with the recording process at all times and are free to stop the recording at any time. If you decide to take part, you are still free to say you do not wish to take part in the study at any time without giving a reason, until 24 hours after the interview. It will not be possible to remove your data from the project 24 hours after the interview as this will be anonymised and transcribed so we will not be able to identify which data is yours. This does not affect your data protection rights. If you decide not to take part you do not need to do anything further.

Data Protection and Confidentiality
➢ What information will you collect about me?

In order to participate in this research project, we will need to collect information that could identify you, called “personal identifiable information”. Specifically, we will need to collect:

- Your full name (on consent form)
- Your signature (on consent form)
- An audio recording of your voice (obtained during the interview)

➢ Under what legal basis are you collecting this information?

We are collecting and storing this personal identifiable information in accordance with data protection law which protect your rights. These state that we must have a legal basis (specific reason) for collecting your data. For this study, the specific reason is that it is “a public interest task” and “a process necessary for research purposes”.

➢ What are my rights in relation to the information you will collect about me?

You have a number of rights under data protection law regarding your personal information. For example you can request a copy of the information we hold about you, including audio recordings. If you would like to know more about your different rights or the way we use your personal information to ensure we follow the law, please consult our Privacy Notice for Research.

➢ Will my participation in the study be confidential and my personal identifiable information be protected?

In accordance with data protection law, The University of Manchester is the Data Controller for this project. This means that we are responsible for making sure your personal information is kept secure, confidential and used only in the way you have been told it will be used. All researchers are trained with this in mind, and your data will be looked after in the following way:

- Measures will be taken to ensure your confidentiality, such as providing you with an assigned ID number only known to the researcher (known as a pseudonym). For the project write-up, quotations from the transcript may be used using this pseudonym.
- Your identifiable audio data (recorded during the interview) will be held on an audio recorder, exclusively for research use, which will be kept on the researcher’s person until transferred onto the University of Manchester’s secure server. Once transferred it will be deleted off the audio recorder within 24 hours. After 24 hours of the interview, the recordings will be used to create transcripts that are transcribed by a UoM approved supplier who has a confidentiality agreement in place between their organisation and UoM. The researcher asks that participants do not disclose any personal identifiable information about their selves or others including names of places like schools, however any that is disclosed will be anonymised during transcription.
- Your identifiable personal data (full name and signature) on the consent form will only be accessed by the researcher. Within 24 hours of the interview, this form will be scanned and uploaded onto the secure UoM server and the hard copy will be destroyed. Following the study, this information will be deleted.
Potential disclosures:

This study intends to interview professionals about an aspect of practice which is within their competence. Whilst unlikely, there could be circumstances where during the course of the interview information is revealed which means that the researcher will be obliged to break confidentiality. Examples of this could include:

- If, during the study, I have concerns about your safety or the safety of others, I will inform your GP.
- If, during the study, you disclose information about misconduct/poor practice, we have a professional obligation to report this and will therefore need to inform your employer/professional body.
- If, during the study, you disclose information about any current or future illegal activities, we have a legal obligation to report this and will therefore need to inform the relevant authorities.

Please also note that individuals from The University of Manchester or regulatory authorities may need to look at the data collected for this study to make sure the project is being carried out as planned. This may involve looking at identifiable data. All individuals involved in auditing and monitoring the study will have a strict duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant.

What if I have a complaint?

➢ Contact details for complaints

If you have a complaint that you wish to direct to members of the research team, please contact:

Professor Kevin Woods (Supervisor and Director of Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology)

Email: kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk
Manchester Institute of Education
School of Environment, Education and Development
Room A5.16 Ellen Wilkinson Building,
Oxford Road,
University of Manchester
M13 9PL
Contact number: Tel: 0161 275 3509

If you wish to make a formal complaint to someone independent of the research team or if you are not satisfied with the response you have gained from the researchers in the first instance then please contact:

The Research Governance and Integrity Officer, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, by emailing: research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk or by telephoning 0161 275 2674.
If you wish to contact us about your data protection rights, please email dataprotection@manchester.ac.uk or write to The Information Governance Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL at the University and we will guide you through the process of exercising your rights.
You also have a right to complain to the Information Commissioner’s Office about complaints relating to your personal identifiable information Tel 0303 123 1113.
**Contact Details**

If you have any queries about the study or if you are interested in taking part then please contact the researcher:

**Chynna Owen (Trainee Educational Psychologist)**  
**Email:** [chynna.owen@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk](mailto:chynna.owen@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk)  
Manchester Institute of Education  
School of Environment, Education and Development  
Ellen Wilkinson Building,  
Oxford Road,  
University of Manchester  
M13 9PL  
**Contact number:** 0161 275 3511
Appendix 6c: Participant Information Sheets – Educational Practitioners/Professionals

The journey from exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Participant Information Sheet (PIS)

You are being invited to take part in a research study which aims to explore the journey of pupils from school exclusion, enrolment at a PRU, to reintegration to a mainstream school. Before you decide whether to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully before deciding whether to take part and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

About the research

➢ Who will conduct the research?

Chynna Owen, a first year Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) at the University of Manchester (UoM).

What is the purpose of the research?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the journey of young people from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). The study intends to recruit participants to form three case studies, making up one multiple case study of reintegration within this local authority (LA). For each case study, the research aims to recruit:

- a young person who has been reintegrated into a mainstream secondary school (MSS);
- their parent or carer;
- an educational practitioner from the PRU that they attended who knows them well;
- an educational practitioner from the MSS that they currently attend who has been involved in their reintegration.

Through the use of research interviews, the study wishes to gather the perspectives and experiences of these participants to gain an insight into the processes involved in reintegration and the facilitators and barriers of reintegration in practice. I hope to generate themes from the data that will inform the thesis research project.

You have been purposively selected to participate in this study based on your involvement in the reintegration of pupils at your school. Your participation and valuable insights will hopefully provide me with a greater understanding of reintegration, which aims to inform reintegration practices within the LA.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

Findings will be written up into a thesis that will be submitted to the University of Manchester as part of the assessment requirements of the Doctorate of Educational and Child Psychology. The
thesis intends to be submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal and the findings may be used in future research.

➢ Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) Check

The data collection will take place within your educational setting. I have undergone an Enhanced DBS check as a Child and Adult Workforce Trainee Educational Psychologist. I will show my enhanced certificate to the school staff on entry.

➢ Who has reviewed the research project?

The project has been reviewed by The School of Environment, Education and Development Ethics Committee at The University of Manchester.

➢ Who is funding the research project?

The project is being funded by the Department for Education Initial Training for Educational Psychologists.

What would my involvement be?

➢ What would I be asked to do if I took part?

A mutually convenient date and time for an interview would then be organised. Before the interview, you would be asked to sign a consent form providing your informed consent to participate (please see the attached form). The duration of the interview would be around 40 minutes and could take place within a room at your school. During the interview you would be asked a series of questions regarding the general processes and your perceptions of the facilitators and barriers of reintegration practice. You will also be asked to reflect upon the journey of a young person who has consented to participating in this research and who will be interviewed about their reintegration journey. You will have the right to withdraw at any point during the interview. The interview will be recorded using an audio recorder stored securely. Following the research, a summary of the study will be shared with you.

➢ What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you wish to take part please send an email to the researcher (contact details at the end of this document) confirming this. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form on the day of the interview (please see attached). The interview will be audio recorded and this is essential to your participation in the study. You should be comfortable with the recording process at all times and are free to stop the recording at any time. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself. However, it will not be possible to remove your data from the project once it has been anonymised and transcribed as we will not be able to identify your specific data. The data will be transcribed 24 hours after the interview takes place. This does not affect your data protection rights. If you decide not to take part you do not need to do anything further.

Data Protection and Confidentiality
What information will you collect about me?

In order to participate in this research project we will need to collect information that could identify you, called “personal identifiable information”. Specifically we will need to collect:

- Your full name (on consent form)
- Your signature (on consent form)
- An audio recording of your voice (obtained during the interview)

Under what legal basis are you collecting this information?

We are collecting and storing this personal identifiable information in accordance with data protection law which protect your rights. These state that we must have a legal basis (specific reason) for collecting your data. For this study, the specific reason is that it is “a public interest task” and “a process necessary for research purposes”.

What are my rights in relation to the information you will collect about me?

You have a number of rights under data protection law regarding your personal information. For example you can request a copy of the information we hold about you, including audio recordings.

If you would like to know more about your different rights or the way we use your personal information to ensure we follow the law, please consult our Privacy Notice for Research.

Will my participation in the study be confidential and my personal identifiable information be protected?

In accordance with data protection law, The University of Manchester is the Data Controller for this project. This means that we are responsible for making sure your personal information is kept secure, confidential and used only in the way you have been told it will be used. All researchers are trained with this in mind, and your data will be looked after in the following way:

- Measures will be taken to ensure your confidentiality, such as providing you with an assigned ID number only known to the researcher (known as a pseudonym). For the project write-up, quotations from the transcript may be used using this pseudonym.
- Your identifiable audio data (recorded during the interview) will be held on an audio recorder, exclusively for research use, which will be kept on the researcher’s person until transferred onto the University of Manchester’s secure server. Once transferred it will be deleted off the audio recorder within 24 hours. After 24 hours of the interview, the recordings will be used to create transcripts that are transcribed by a UoM approved supplier who has a confidentiality agreement is in place between their organisation and UoM. The researcher asks that participants do not disclose any personal identifiable information about their selves or others including names of places like schools, however any that is disclosed will be anonymised during transcription.
- Your identifiable personal data (full name and signature) on the consent form will only be accessed by the researcher. Within 24 hours of the interview, this form will be scanned and uploaded onto the secure UoM server and the hard copy will be destroyed. Following the study, this information will be deleted.
Potential disclosures:

This study intends to interview professionals about an aspect of practice which is within their competence. Whilst unlikely, there could be circumstances where during the course of the interview information is revealed which means that the researcher will be obliged to break confidentiality. Examples of this could include:

- If, during the study, I have concerns about your safety or the safety of others, I will inform your GP.
- If, during the study, you disclose information about misconduct/poor practice, we have a professional obligation to report this and will therefore need to inform your employer/professional body.
- If, during the study, you disclose information about any current or future illegal activities, we have a legal obligation to report this and will therefore need to inform the relevant authorities.

Please also note that individuals from The University of Manchester or regulatory authorities may need to look at the data collected for this study to make sure the project is being carried out as planned. This may involve looking at identifiable data. All individuals involved in auditing and monitoring the study will have a strict duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant.

What if I have a complaint?

➢ Contact details for complaints

If you have a complaint that you wish to direct to members of the research team, please contact:

Professor Kevin Woods (Supervisor and Director of Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology)

Email: kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk
Manchester Institute of Education
School of Environment, Education and Development
Room A5.16 Ellen Wilkinson Building,
Oxford Road,
University of Manchester
M13 9PL
Contact number: Tel: 0161 275 3509

If you wish to make a formal complaint to someone independent of the research team or if you are not satisfied with the response you have gained from the researchers in the first instance then please contact:

The Research Governance and Integrity Officer, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, by emailing: research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk or by telephoning 0161 275 2674.

If you wish to contact us about your data protection rights, please email dataprotection@manchester.ac.uk or write to The Information Governance Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL at the University and we will guide you through the process of exercising your rights.

You also have a right to complain to the Information Commissioner’s Office about complaints relating to your personal identifiable information Tel 0303 123 1113.
Contact Details

If you have any queries about the study or if you are interested in taking part then please contact the researcher:

Chynna Owen (Trainee Educational Psychologist)
Email: chynna.owen@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
Manchester Institute of Education
School of Environment, Education and Development
Ellen Wilkinson Building,
Oxford Road,
University of Manchester
M13 9PL
Contact number: 0161 275 3511
Appendix 7: Consent and assent forms

Appendix 7a: Child assent form (12 years and under)

The journey from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Tell us if you want to take part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Do you know what we will be doing today?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Do you want to ask me any more questions about it?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3  Do you know that you can change your mind if you do not want to take part anymore?  
   You do not have to tell me why.                                             | Yes/No |
| 4  Are you happy if I write what you tell me in my books, articles, presentations, or reports, if I don’t use your name? | Yes/No |
| 5  Are you happy for the sound of the interviews to be recorded?           | Yes/No |
| 6  Do you know that the things you tell me might be looked at by people who help to keep you safe? | Yes/No |
| 7  Are you happy if I share what we do with other people who do work like me? | Yes/No |
| 8  Do you know we might have to tell your parents, guardians or teachers things you say? | Yes/No |
| 9  Are you happy to take part in what we talked about?                     | Yes/No |

If you don’t want to take part, don’t sign your name!
If you do want to take part, you can write your name below

________________________            ________________________  
Name of Child  
Signature  
Date

________________________            ________________________  
Name of the person taking assent  
Signature  
Date

1 copy for the participant, 1 copy for the research team (original)
Appendix 7b: Child assent form (13 years and over)

The journey from permanent exclusion to reintegration through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Tell us if you want to take part by circling all that you agree with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Do you understand what the study is about?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Have you asked all the questions you want to ask about the study?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Did you understand the answers to your questions?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Do you understand you can stop the study at any time without giving a reason?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Are you happy that things you tell the researchers, with your name removed, will be used in the books, articles, presentations, or reports they write, and shared with other researchers?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Are you happy that things you say in the study will be looked at by people at the University of Manchester or other people who help to make sure that you are kept safe?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Are you happy for the interviews to be audio recorded?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Are you happy for researchers or people at other Universities to ask you to help with other studies in the future?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Do you understand that the researchers may have to tell your parents, guardians or teachers, things you said in the study if they are worried about you?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Are you happy to take part in the study?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you don’t want to take part, don’t sign your name!
If you do want to take part, you can write your name below

________________________            ________________________
Name of Child                  Signature                  Date

________________________            ________________________
Name of the person taking assent Signature                  Date

1 copy for the participant, 1 copy for the research team (original)
# Appendix 7c: Parental consent form for young person

## The journey from exclusion to reintegration of pupils through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England

### Parental Consent Form

If you are happy for _____________ to participate in the study, please complete and sign the consent form below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet (Version 2, date 28/08/2020) for the above study and have had the opportunity to read the information and ask questions and had these answered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I understand that my child’s participation in the study is voluntary and that they are free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. I understand that it will not be possible to remove my child’s data from the project once it has been anonymised and forms part of the data set. I agree for my child to take part on this basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I agree to the interviews being audio recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books, reports or journals, or shared in a data repository, or used in a presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I understand that data collected during the study may be looked at by individuals from The University of Manchester or regulatory authorities, where it is relevant to my taking part in this research. I give permission for these individuals to have access to the data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I agree that any data collected during the study may be used for future studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I agree that the researchers may retain my contact details in order to provide my child and I with a summary of the findings for this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I understand that there may be instances where during the course of the interview information is revealed which means that the researcher will be obliged to break confidentiality and this has been explained in more detail in the information sheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I agree for my child to take part in this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Protection

The personal information we collect and use to conduct this research will be processed in accordance with data protection law as explained in the Participant Information Sheet and the Privacy Notice for Research Participants.

________________________  __________________________  ____________________
Name of Participant        Signature                       Date

________________________  __________________________  ____________________
Name of the person taking consent    Signature                       Date

1 copy for the participant, 1 copy for the research team (original).
Appendix 7d: Consent form for parent/caregiver participants

The journey from exclusion to reintegration of pupils through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.

Consent Form

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet (Version 1, date 28/08/2020) for the above study and have had the opportunity to read the information and ask questions and had these answered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to leave the study at any time without giving a reason. I understand that it will not be possible to remove my data from the project once it has been anonymised and forms part of the data set. I agree to take part on this basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I agree to the interviews being audio recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books, reports, journals, or shared in a data repository, or used in presentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I understand that data collected during the study may be looked at by individuals from The University of Manchester or regulatory authorities, where it is relevant to my taking part in this research. I give permission for these individuals to have access to my data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I agree that any data collected during the study may be used for future studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I agree that the researcher may keep my contact details in order to provide me with a summary of the findings for this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I understand that there may be instances where during the course of the interview information is revealed which means that the researcher will be obliged to break confidentiality and this has been explained in more detail in the information sheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I agree to take part in this study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Protection

The personal information we collect and use to conduct this research will be processed in accordance with data protection law as explained in the Participant Information Sheet and the Privacy Notice for Research Participants.

________________________  __________________________
Name of Participant        Signature                     Date

________________________  __________________________
Name of the person taking consent        Signature                     Date

1 copy for the participant, 1 copy for the research team (original).
### Appendix 7e: Consent form for educational practitioners/ professional

**The journey from exclusion to reintegration of pupils through a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in England.**

**Consent Form**

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet (Version 2, date 28/08/2020) for the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to myself. I understand that it will not be possible to remove my data from the project once it has been anonymised and forms part of the data set. I agree to take part on this basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I agree to the interviews being audio recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books, reports, journals, or shared in a data repository, or in presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I understand that data collected during the study may be looked at by individuals from The University of Manchester or regulatory authorities, where it is relevant to my taking part in this research. I give permission for these individuals to have access to my data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I agree that any data collected during the study may be used for future studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I agree that the researchers may retain my contact details in order to provide me with a summary of the findings for this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I understand that there may be instances where during the course of the interview information is revealed which means that the researchers will be obliged to break confidentiality and this has been explained in more detail in the information sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I agree to take part in this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Protection**

The personal information we collect and use to conduct this research will be processed in accordance with data protection law as explained in the Participant Information Sheet and the Privacy Notice for Research Participants.

| __________________________  | __________________________  | __________________________ |
| __________________________  | Signature                  | Date                      |
| __________________________  | __________________________  | __________________________ |

Name of Participant

Name of the person taking consent

1 copy for the participant, 1 copy for the research team (original).
Appendix 8: Interview Schedules

Appendix 8a: Young person interview schedule

Areas to cover

Permanent Exclusion

• Can you tell me about the school you attended before *insert name of PRU*?
  Prompts: teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, family’s views.

PRU experience

• Can you tell me about your experience in *insert name of PRU*?
• How was *insert name of PRU* similar or different to your previous school?
  Prompts: involvement in decisions, understanding of *insert name of PRU*, teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, family’s views.

Transition from PRU to mainstream

• Can you tell me about the transition from *insert name of PRU* to your new school?
• How ready did you feel for the reintegration?
• How did *insert name of PRU* help you prepare for your transition?
• What do you think was helpful?
• What do you think *insert name of PRU* or your new school could have done better to help your transition?
  Prompts: How did you feel about leaving/starting your new school? How was the transition process explained to you?

Current mainstream school

• Can you tell me about your first week in *name of new school*?
• How have you settled into the school now?
• What is similar or different to *insert name of PRU*?
• What has helped you through this process of reintegration?
  Prompt: Any specific strategies, support or intervention?

Future

• How do you think you will get on in your new school?
• What are your hopes for the future?
• How do you think you will achieve your goals?
  Prompts: Responding to their support, relationships with teachers, peer relationships, academic goals, other goals, post 16 plans, career aspirations.
Appendix 8b: Parent/ caregiver interview schedule

Areas to cover

Permanent Exclusion

• Can you tell me about the school *name of young people* attended before the PRU?
  Prompts: teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, *name of young people*’s views.

PRU experience

• Can you tell me about *name of young people*’s time in the PRU?
• How was the PRU similar or different to their previous school? Prompts: involvement in decisions, understanding of the PRU, teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, family’s views.

Transition from PRU to mainstream

• Can you tell me about *name of young people*’s transition from the PRU to their new school?
• How did the PRU help *name of young people* prepare for their transition?
• What do you think the PRU or *name of new school* could have done better to help their transition?
• How was *name of young people*’s level of readiness for the reintegration determined?
• What has helped *name of young people* through this process of reintegration?
  Prompt: are there any specific coping strategies, support or intervention that have helped them?

Current mainstream school

• How has *name of young people* settled into *name of new school*?
• What is similar or different to the PRU?

Future

• How do you think *name of young people* will get on in their new school?
• What are your hopes for the future?
• How do you think *name of young people* will achieve their goals? Prompts: Responding to support, relationships with teachers, peer relationships, academic goals, other goals, post 16 plans, career aspirations.
Appendix 8c: PRU staff interview schedule

Areas to cover

Permanent Exclusion

- What do you feel is the impact of a permanent exclusion on young people and how is this managed by the PRU?
- Prompts: teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, *name of young people*’s views.

PRU experience

- Can you tell me about *name of young people*’s experience in the PRU from your perspective?
- Prompts: involvement in decisions, understanding of the PRU, teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, young person’s and their family’s views towards exclusion and PRU.

Transition from PRU to mainstream

- Can you explain the processes involved when a pupil transitions from a PRU to *name of mainstream school*?
- Can you tell me about *name of young people*’s transition from the PRU to *name of new school*?
- How is a young person’s level of readiness for the reintegration determined?
- What do you think works well and how do you think the process of transition could be improved? Prompt: How are pupils prepared for reintegration? Farewells?

Reintegration to mainstream

- What do you perceive to be the facilitators/ barriers through the journey of reintegration? Prompts: child characteristics; pupil attitudes to reintegration; the role of the family; resources; ethos of school; what has helped them through this process; any specific coping strategies, support or intervention?
- What do you feel is the impact of this journey of reintegration on pupils and how is this managed? Prompt: what coping strategies do you think are important?
- How is the voice of the young person captured throughout their journey of reintegration?

Future outcomes

- How has *name of young people* settled into *name of new school*?
- What are your hopes for *name of young people*’s future and how do you think they will achieve their goals?
- Prompts: Responding to support, relationships with teachers, peer relationships, academic goals, other goals, post 16 plans, career aspirations.
Appendix 8d: MSS staff interview schedule

Areas to cover

Permanent Exclusion

- What do you feel is the impact of a permanent exclusion on young people? Prompts: teachers, peers, support, senior staff, behaviour policy, feelings, understanding of exclusion, views towards exclusion, *name of young people*’s views.

Transition from PRU to mainstream

- Can you explain the processes involved when a pupil transitions to *name of new school* from the PRU?
- How is a young person’s level of readiness for the reintegration determined?
- Can you tell me about *name of young people*’s transition from the PRU to *name of new school*?
- What do you think works well and how do you think the process of transition could be improved? Prompt: How are pupils prepared for reintegration? Farewells?

Reintegration to mainstream

- What do you perceive to be the facilitators/ barriers through the journey of reintegration? Prompts: child characteristics; pupil attitudes to reintegration; the role of the family; resources; ethos of school; what has helped them through this process; any specific coping strategies, support, or intervention?
- What do you feel is the impact of this journey of reintegration on pupils and how is this managed? Prompt: what coping strategies do you think are important?
- How does the school try to instil a sense of belonging in the reintegrated pupils? Prompts: support, intervention.
- How is the voice of the young person captured throughout their journey of reintegration?

Future outcomes

- How has *name of young people* settled into *name of new school*?
- What are your hopes for *name of young people*’s future and how do you think they will achieve their goals? Prompts: Responding to support, relationships with teachers, peer relationships, academic goals, other goals, post 16 plans, career aspirations.
Appendix 8e: Outreach worker interview schedule

Areas to cover

Role of outreach

• Could you start by talking about what your role is in a YP’s reintegration journey

Permanent Exclusion

• What do you feel is the impact of a permanent exclusion on young people?
• How did this impact on the YP?
• What were your views of the exclusion?
• What support is offered to YP at this stage?

PRU experience

• Can you tell me about the YP’s experience in The PRU from your perspective?
• How is the impact of a permanent exclusion managed?

Transition from PRU to mainstream

• Can you explain the processes involved in the reintegration from The PRU back to mainstream?
• What was your involvement at this stage of the transition?
• Can you tell me about the YP’s reintegration.
• How is a young person’s level of readiness for the reintegration determined?
• What do you think works well and how do you think the process of transition could be improved?
• How has the YP settled into his new MSS?

Reintegration to mainstream

• What do you perceive to be the facilitators/ barriers through the journey of reintegration?
• What do you feel is the impact of this journey of reintegration on YPs and how is this managed?
• What coping strategies do you think are important?
• How is the voice of the YP captured throughout their journey of reintegration?

Future outcomes

• What are your hopes for the YP’s future and how do you think they will achieve these goals?
• What is the plan in terms of your involvement?
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Appendix 10: Gatekeeper email to young persons

Dear *insert name of young person*,

Thank you for speaking with me over the phone today and letting me tell you about the research project.

As discussed, the research project is being conducted by Chynna Owen. Chynna is a Trainee Educational Psychologist at the University of Manchester. She is currently on a course to learn to become an Educational Psychologist. An Educational Psychologist is someone who works with lots of different young people in different schools. They try to find different ways of helping children and young people with lots of different things.

As part of her course, Chynna is completing a research project. She is interested in finding out about the experiences of young people who have attended a short stay school, like *insert name of PRU*, and then moved to a mainstream secondary school.

For the project Chynna is looking for young people, parents/ carers and teachers to talk to her about the journey young people go on after they have been excluded from a school, join a pupil referral unit and then go back to a mainstream school. The research aims to find out about their experiences so schools including *insert name of PRU* can learn lessons and know how to make it better.

**It is really important that you know you do not have to take part in this research, and you do not have to agree to Chynna telling you more about the research.**

I would really appreciate it if you could please reply to this email by copy and pasting one of the responses (in the section at the bottom of this email below the dotted line) into your reply.

If you have any questions about this research, then feel free to ask either me or Chynna after she has emailed you.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Many thanks,

Gatekeeper

Are you interested in knowing more about the research project and are happy for the researcher (Chynna) to email you about it?

No thank you, I don’t want to take part.

Yes please, I would like Chynna to email me more details.
Appendix 11: Overview of the thematic analysis process

Interview data was analysed using the following six stages of thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2013). The data within Case One was analysed using these stages which developed a cumulative coding framework. This was then used to analyse Case Two through the process of constant comparative analysis (Boeije, 2002).

1) **Familiarisation with the data**: the researcher immersed themselves in the data through listening to the audio-recorded data and reading and re-reading the transcript. Initial analytic observations were noted during this process.

2) **Coding**: The researcher coded interesting features of each interview transcript in relation to the three research questions. The researcher coded the data at the manifest and latent levels, examining the implicit content. The researcher collated the codes and relevant data extracts of the PRU practitioner interview within Case One using NVivo (see below). These codes were then used to code the YP interview transcript, adding to the list of generated codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Coded By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodes\Gradual reintegration to mainstream</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With [student], she wanted to phase it in because it’s a lot of her...her...you know...it triggered her social anxiety around big groups again and the noise levels. So we agreed a...for her to have a couple more visits...while she was still on roll with us and then she would start part days...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nodes\Honest information sharing with MSS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>0.0189</th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the school had all of the information that we had and not only that, but got it as well...and that’s really, really key to be honest that the school gets...who it is that we’re sending them and that we’re as honest with the school as we possibly can be...about what they need and what problems they’re going to face otherwise the child...won’t succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                      |          |          |                              |                  |          |
| I was able to say to the staff... ’Right, so there will be periods when...and these are the times when she will need to access it, and this is what it will look like, and this is...’ and then we agreed there and then how she would ask to access it. So...you know, those...that was something she had identified as needing...to be continued as a support strategy...moving forward into the next |
3) **Searching for themes:** The researcher looked for meaningful patterns in the data of both interviews that were relevant to the research questions and constructs their codes into potential themes (see below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript extract</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Global theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would have normally come in at the start and sort of met him, explained my role but then I... I go away then for... for almost like an indefinite period of time until he's deemed ready. And then I come back and I think sometimes perhaps it would be... better if it was reviewed more often or perhaps I... I met with him, even if it was like termly... just so I was like, you know, still a familiar face to him [...] it would have been nice to have a bit more time to have... to have built that relationship with him...</td>
<td>Need for continued mentor/outreach support</td>
<td>Need for consistent mentor support</td>
<td>MSS barriers to reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for increased outreach support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of emotional support MSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of time of reintegration (lack of preparation time due to small window of opportunity)</td>
<td>Timing and pace of reintegration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for more gradual reintegration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of COVID – on gaps in learning, face-to-face contact from services)</td>
<td>Impact of COVID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Right, I had to push because... [child] hadn’t done full days in mainstream school since... maybe before the Christmas because he was skipping so much school... so... because of lockdown and because he was skipping school, it was months since he’d done full days in mainstream and I had to fight for him to have a gradual process, they wanted him straight in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I had a lot of isolations in that period because it was just the nature of our job, you know, we were going out and we were being told and... any kind of contact, you know, you’d be isolating... every other week. But I think... I think during the period from about April to the start of June... I had so many weeks working at home because I had to isolate. I missed quite a few sessions (Outreach Worker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, I think he found it quite tough because I think... in [student]’s instance, he... wasn’t necessarily keen on certain elements of... the reintegration, like the buddy system, you know, trying to help him establish friendships. [Student] was just focused on the end goal and... you know, being able to achieve his qualifications and move forward. (MSS practitioner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YP’s lack of motivation to socially integrate</td>
<td>Lack of social integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance from MSS barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to finish school quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of opportunity to fully integrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) **Reviewing themes**: The themes were checked to see if they ‘worked’ in relation to the coded extract of the individual interview transcripts and then together for the interview transcripts within that Case Study. A thematic map of the analysis for Case One was generated.

5) **Defining and naming themes**: The researcher wrote a detailed analysis and generated clear definitions and names for each theme.

6) **Writing up**: The researcher selected compelling extracts to include within the write up that wove the analytic narrative for Case One together.

The above stages were repeated with Case Two. For the coding stage, the codes and themes generated from Case One formed a cumulative coding framework that was used to search for codes and themes within Case Two. This process allowed for non-relevant themes and codes to be discarded or changes, and new codes and themes to emerge. Following analysis of the individual case studies, a cross-case synthesis was conducted. The researcher configured the analysis of each case study into a ‘reintegration journey’ model of global themes and associated subthemes at each stage of the reintegration journey (before, during, and after the AP placement).
Appendix 12: Quotation extracts from Case Study One, YP (Emma) interview

they got me...like my own little personal teacher assistant...in class, so like she would sit next to me and help me understand words and stuff... (YP)

like if she saw me in the corridor, she’d pull me aside and talk to me and ask me how like my day’s been going and so she was nice (YP)

She was nice...she always used to...like if she saw me in the corridor, she’d pull me aside and talk to me and ask me how like my day’s been going and so she was nice. (YP)

I couldn’t really have an opportunity to ask for help (YP)

But it wasn’t very good with helping me in class...because I have ADHD and dyslexia...so it makes it harder for me to...like understand things sometimes. (YP)

kind of angry as well because I was like...it wasn’t my fault that I got kicked out, it was the other person’s because they started...like the whole situation... (YP)

like all the kids were loud and the teachers kind of would just give up after a while in trying to get them quiet ...very...very loud. (YP)

LA funded private tutor before I actually went to the [PRU], I got tutored in a library for a bit (YP) saying that I’d do well (YP)

they were just being very confident, happy and cheerful about it (YP)

which I found very handy (YP)

They were really funny. I miss them (YP)

just being nice to me (YP)

that’s why I chose to come here because I knew him...and the other school, I didn’t know anyone else (YP)

try and help me catch up a little bit like (YP)

private study session (YP)

Yeah, there was only me and two other students (YP)

they just told me to do my best as if I was still in a real like...mainstream school, which I did try (YP)

we went for a...it was an hour and a half look around the school before the meeting (YP)

Individualised timetable, one less option than everyone else...because I...I joined in...so I’d just go and sit up in [name of room] for an hour and then go to my other lesson (YP)

Or sometimes we’d have a chilled day and just play cards with the other two students that were in there (YP)