UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

A systematic literature review of the 'managed move' process as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools

Messeter, Tamzin; Soni, Anita

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

A systematic literature review of the 'managed move' process as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools

Tamzin Messeter

Department of Disability, Inclusion and Special Needs, School of Education, University of Birmingham

TXM518@student.bham.ac.uk

Anita Soni (corresponding author)

Department of Disability, Inclusion and Special Needs, School of Education, University of Birmingham, Pritchatts Road, Edgbaston, B15 2TT

sonia@adf.bham.ac.uk

01214143603

Abstract

This paper reports the findings from a systematic review of research evidence on the use of managed moves as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools. The review begins by discussing the political landscape of school exclusion, the concept of managed moves and their use with children and young people (CYP) 'at risk' of permanent exclusion. During a systematic search nine papers were identified, reviewed and appraised using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist. A synthesis of the literature identified the most prominent factors relevant to successful integration of pupils following a managed move using pupil, parent and LA staff perspectives. Despite the paucity of research on the topic, this report finds there are key features associated with successful transition during a managed move. Developing new relationships with both staff and peers is key for CYP, in order that a sense of belonging is created for them in their new environment. Further factors supporting successful reintegration are effective communication between all stakeholders and a personalised and pastoral support plan for the CYP. This review holds relevance for those working in schools who may encounter CYP at risk of exclusion during their practice. As a result of the findings, recommendations are offered for schools, groups of schools and regional protocols for managed moves.

Key words: managed moves, exclusion, successful integration, pastoral support

INTRODUCTION

School exclusion

The focus of this paper is to review research evidence relating to managed moves. Previous reviews have aimed to assess effectiveness of interventions to support behaviour in school (Solomon *et al.*, 2012) and reduce disciplinary exclusion (Spink, 2011), but no review offers an exclusive focus on managed moves. A recent finding suggests the most common alternative to exclusion in the UK is a managed move to another school (Gazeley and Marrable, 2015). The landscape of school exclusion will be explored before defining the managed move process.

In 1986 in the UK, 'fixed-term' and 'permanent' exclusions were introduced as a last resort to remove a pupil from a school if they had been persistently or severely deviating from the school's behaviour policy (Education Act, 1986). A fixed-term exclusion may last for hours or days for a maximum of 45 days in an academic year. A permanent exclusion removes the child or young person (CYP) from the school's roll or transfers them to an alternative provision such as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) (Department for Education (DfE), 2012). Children and young people in England are seven times more likely to be excluded if they have special educational needs (SEN), four times more likely to be in receipt of free school meals and three times more likely to be male (DfE, 2011).

Exclusion is a relevant topic to all staff working in schools as every member of staff may work with CYP with challenging behaviour and or SEN, however this is of particular interest to pastoral teams and Senior Leaders in schools. In England, most exclusions result from persistent disruptive behaviour which locates the problem within the child (Parsons, 2009). This is stressed in the wording of policy documents such as 'Behaviour and Discipline in Schools' (DfE, 2011) which Parsons (2009) suggests should be renamed to emphasise the importance of relationships in school, where responsibility is shared with adults and the organisation.

Despite a range of initiatives to reduce exclusion, data for academic year 2014/15 show an increase in both fixed-term and permanent exclusion from 2013/14 across all school types in the United Kingdom and now equates to an average of 31 permanent and 1509 fixed-term exclusions a day (DfE, 2016). Exclusion data does not include 'grey' or unofficial exclusions such as sending a CYP home without a formal exclusion (Office of the Children's Commissioner (OCC), 2011).

In 2000, the Labour Government introduced academy schools through the Learning and Skills Act (2000) in a bid to improve school performance. As academies receive their funding directly from the government, they do not come under local authority (LA) scrutiny, although they are subject to the same laws as LA maintained schools (DfE, 2015). For example, laws regarding Special Educational Needs, exclusions and admissions however they can determine their own arrangements for these rather than being guided by the LA. There are no academies in Wales or Scotland as currently the Welsh and Scottish Governments reject the academy model (Lewis, 2016). Academies have faced criticism in the media for reportedly attempting illegal exclusions of some of the most vulnerable pupils in schools, (Hirsch, 2015) permanently excluding at nearly double the rate of maintained secondary schools (Adams, 2015). A possible reason for these high exclusion numbers in academies is they may be driven by their need to produce favourable academic results to attract funding to open new schools within an Academy Trust.

There are numerous detrimental consequences to excluding CYP from school (Michail, 2011) and the implications can be long lasting (Sellman *et al.,* 2002). The effects not only impact the individual but their family, who must also deal with the stigma and negative consequences (Daniels, 2011). Exclusion can leave the most vulnerable CYP feeling labelled and rejected (Pomeroy, 1999). It has been argued exclusion does not comply with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (1989) in that the interests of the CYP should be at the core of decisions made

about their education (Parsons, 2005), CYP are repeatedly failed in this respect (OCC, 2011). Parsons (2009) adds that, "exclusion from school, either permanently or for a fixed period, is a quiet mockery of *Every Child Matters*," (p.7).

Currently, schools can employ a range of alternatives for CYP at risk of exclusion and may seek support from external agencies, the use of reduced timetables, time outs and internal exclusions. Evidence-based interventions targeting anger management or restorative justice (Morrison, 2006) can also be used. Teachers, teaching assistants or learning mentors may be offered training and support on behaviour management techniques for the classroom (Hayes *et al.*, 2011; Pane *et al.*, 2014). Lastly, programmes such as multi-systemic therapy can be offered as comprehensive prevention strategies offered at a systemic level to support the school and family (Fox and Ashmore, 2014) but targeted inventions like this are costly and difficult to access.

Managed moves

Historically, the UK government has faced pressure to reduce exclusion rates, leading to the exploration of alternatives. The Labour Government introduced the concept of the managed move as one such alternative in 2004. Several advisory documents published by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), then known as the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and later renamed DfE, encouraged schools to try a managed move before excluding a pupil (DfES, 2004, DCSF, 2010, DfE, 2015). Parallels are drawn to the importance of collaboration and partnerships between schools to prevent school exclusion and improve behaviour.

The principle aim of a managed move is to collaboratively problem solve between the school, CYP and their families, allowing the CYP to move to a new provision in strategic manner (Abdelnoor, 2007). The key difference between a managed move and exclusion is that it should be a voluntary agreement between all parties (DfES, 2004). A carefully designed transition from one education

setting to the next is at the centre of the process, targeted at CYP on a trajectory to permanent exclusion (Abdelnoor, 2007). The process should be flexible, allowing for issues to be responded to by schools or external agencies and should be facilitated by someone impartial (DfES, 2004). Contrary to exclusion, with a managed move, significance is placed on planning so the CYP is included in the process (Abdelnoor, 2007).

In the UK, there is no statutory requirement for schools to use managed moves as an alternative to exclusion. Current guidance simply states, "a pupil can also transfer to another school as part of a 'managed move' where this occurs with the consent of the parties involved, including the parents." (DfE, 2015, p.6). At present, there are no set standards for best practice with which to hold schools to account (Centre for Social Justice, 2011) therefore, there may be varied commitments across provisions. It is believed managed moves can provide a positive option, offering a fresh start to CYP, when they are governed appropriately (OCC, 2013). However, the process may be open to exploitation as they are not monitored by the DfE and there is no standardised or regulatory system in place to record how often they are used or what process is followed. An Ofsted report warned of two LAs who had discontinued managed moves of pupils between schools after a pilot scheme. This report, concerned with children missing from education, highlighted that during the managed move process it was too easy for pupils to become lost in the system (Ofsted, 2010). With the recent government push for, 'a school-led system' and 'every school an academy' (DfE, 2016b, p.53) the autonomy granted to schools is diminishing LA responsibility and influence.

It is important to recognise managed moves sit on a continuum of provision with a range of alternatives to exclusion on offer. Gazeley *et al.*, (2013) found in six case study schools, there was a commitment to using managed moves as a last resort before permanently excluding a CYP. They created a diagram to illustrate the continuum of provision and prevention (*Figure 1*). In their study, two out of six schools reduced exclusion figures to zero following the continuum.

Insert Figure 1   Exclusion and alternatives to exclusion: a continuum of provision (Gazeley et al., 2013, p.25)

Who is involved in managed moves?

Government documentation referring to managed moves does not indicate who should be involved in a managed move as these are not part of a statutory process, and as a result is determined by the LA protocol. Guidance on school behaviour and attendance partnerships (DCSF, 2010) states schools should work together to develop 'clear protocols for managed moves' (p.6). In addition, LAs are advised to have a protocol in place to ensure a pupil's difficulties are fully addressed (DfES, 2004). Some LAs do provide protocols for schools to follow although it is unclear how they came to make their recommendations. An analysis was undertaken in Chadwick's (2013) work who found the following gaps in three LA protocols:

- No reference to obtaining the views of CYP or parents when considering a managed move

- No reference to a key adult or advocate throughout the process

- No consideration of utilising pupil strengths

Abelnoor (2007) named the key participants in the managed move process as representatives of the current education setting, representatives of the proposed new education setting, the child and their parents or carers, other concerned agencies and a managed moves facilitator. Schools may also employ support from a range of other support services offered by their LA such as behaviour or learning support before proceeding with a managed move.

Rationale for review

As there is no published review evaluating the managed move process, it is not yet clear what factors make a move successful and the impact the process has on a CYP and their families. Systematic reviews have been widely used to synthesise evidence in clinical research (Mickenautsch, 2010) typically using numerical data collected from randomised control trials to

allow for generalisations. Recently, there has been recognition of the value of qualitative research and the importance of listening to service user voice (Dixon-Woods *et al.*, 2007). Qualitative synthesis allows readers to understand the implications of a collection of qualitative studies, offering insight into the views and experiences of participants (Boeije, Van Wesel and Alisic, 2011). As managed moves are being utilised throughout the country without close monitoring, identifying the experiences of those who have knowledge of the process is invaluable. The synthesis of qualitative findings can be of use to policymakers responsible for prioritising resources based on need (Kane, Wood and Barlow, 2007) therefore the findings of this review could be of use to LAs or Academy Trusts.

Research questions

The present review seeks to investigate what CYP, their parents and LA staff perceive as factors facilitating a positive managed move as well as the associated difficulties and the impact of the move.

In doing this, the review will aim to meet the following objectives:

- – Search for papers which discuss lived experiences of pupils, parents, school staff and LA staff who have been involved in a managed move in a UK school.
- – Synthesise the literature to evaluate the facilitating and limiting factors of a managed move.

As there is little data on how managed moves are currently being used, this systematic review seeks to answer the following research questions:

- – In what circumstances or contexts are managed moves used?
- – What are the features of a managed move associated with successful reintegration?
- – What are the difficulties associated with a managed move?

–   What is the impact of a managed move for the LA staff, school staff, CYP and their parents?

METHOD

Search Strategy

This systematic review used the nine-step process as detailed by Boland, Cherry and Dickson (2013). First, scoping searches were performed to identify background literature on alternatives to exclusion. At this point the focus of the review was narrowed to managed moves. Bibliographic databases were searched to identify published and unpublished literature on managed moves.

Full-test papers were identified by searching relevant electronic databases; EBSCO, PROQUEST, PsychInfo (1963-) and eEThOs during searches in September and October 2016. Reference lists of retrieved articles were examined although this failed to yield any additional papers. Papers were screened by their title and abstracts. Following this, full text screening was carried out.

The search term 'managed move$' was used across the databases as it is a specific phrase coined to label the specific process. After the first search was run, subsequent discussion with LA colleagues and peers highlighted in some LAs different terminology may be used for the process. An additional search was run using the term 'managed transfer$". The terms 'preventative place, school transfer, placement transfer, provision transfer, alternative provision and alternative exclusion' were also tried but these terms did not return any additional results relevant to a managed move.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Only studies of qualitative research design, conducted in primary or secondary schools in the UK were included. Peer reviewed articles and unpublished theses were included for review. Guidance

or legislation documentation and newspaper articles were excluded. As managed moves were

introduced in 2004, the search was limited to the following dates: 01/01/2004 – 01/10/2016. A total

of 9 papers were included for full review.

Critical appraisal

There has been debate about the process of appraising qualitative literature, particularly when used to inform policy and practice (Dixon-Woods *et al.*, 2007). Managed moves provide an example of where reference to policy, judgements by professionals, individual behaviour and social context interact, producing an outcome that can be recorded as qualitative data. Dixon-Woods and colleagues (2007) argue it is not possible to produce a reliable measure of appraising qualitative research quality however they note that in the case of inexperienced reviewers, tools such as the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) (CASP, 2016) provide a useful framework of reference. The tool enables researchers to be cautious when making claims which may be spurious regarding the quality of qualitative research.

The papers identified in this review were appraised by their methodological rigour, conceptual depth and breadth (Hannes, 2011). Using the 10 questions and prompts of the CASP, each paper was assessed in turn. The first two criteria of the CASP ask, 'Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?' and 'Is qualitative methodology appropriate?' If the studies met these first two criteria they were included in the synthesis.

Synthesis

There are challenges to synthesising qualitative research data as it is specific to context, participants and time and therefore not generalisable. 'Thematic synthesis' is a termed coined by Thomas and Harden (2008) for the translation of thematic analysis (Braun and Clark, 2006) of primary research for use in systematic reviews. This innovative approach is appropriate as it is tailored to focus on reviews of people's experiences and perspectives.

The aim was to identify natural groupings or themes in the data that represented something important in relation to the research questions. A top-down approach was used to identify themes to

answer the research question. The way in which the process was conducted can be seen below.

Insert *Figure 2*   Process for reaching final themes

RESULTS

Description of included studies

An overview of the characteristics of each study selected for review is presented in Table 1. This provides information on the paper type, setting in which the research was conducted, methods of data collection and findings summary. Four of the nine studies were unpublished theses completed by Trainee Educational Psychologists completing their Doctoral training (Chadwick, 2013; Muir, 2013; Craig, 2015; Hoyle, 2016). Of the remaining studies, all were peer reviewed journal articles published in the 'Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties' Journal (Vincent *et al.*, 2007; Bagley and Hallam, 2015, 2016; Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016) except for Harris *et al.*, (2006) which was published in 'Pastoral Care'. Seven of the papers were published within the last three years (Chadwick, 2013; Muir, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2015, 2016; Craig, 2015; Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016; Hoyle, 2016), highlighting the recency of this research area.

Study characteristics

Seven of the nine studies used semi-structured interviews for data collection. One study used unstructured interviews (Craig, 2015) and one used focus groups (Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016). All interviews and focus groups were audiotaped and transcribed prior to data analysis. Data were predominantly collected from secondary schools although two studies used participants in primary (Craig, 2015; Bagley and Hallam, 2016). The data analysis approach was largely to seek themes from the interview data and deduce ideas from the findings; six of the nine studies used thematic analysis (Harris *et al.*, 2006; Vincent *et al.*, 2007; Chadwick, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2015, 2016; Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016). One study used a narrative analysis (Craig, 2015) and two used

interpretive phenomenological analysis (Muir, 2013; Hoyle, 2016). They were all undertaken in England.

Participant characteristics

The total number of participants across the nine studies equals 106. This is divided into 35 CYP who have experienced a managed move and an additional 3 CYP who received funding to support them in school, 16 parent/carers, 39 school staff and 13 LA officers. Of the studies that stated gender of the pupil participants, 22 were male and 8 female. All participants offered retrospective accounts of the managed move process and all volunteered to take part in the research to form a purposive sample.

Insert Table 1 Results of review papers

Methodological quality was compromised most often where the researcher had not made explicit how their relationship may have affected the participants and where the data analysis process was unclear. For example in two of the papers by the same authors (Harris *et al.*, 2006; Vincent *et al.*, 2007) the authors were not transparent about how they identified their themes.

Identified themes

After proceeding through the stages of thematic synthesis, three key themes were identified. These were labelled: factors supporting successful reintegration, difficulties associated with the move and impact on the CYP. Subthemes were identified within each theme and can be found in *Figure 3*

Figure 3   Thematic map identifying the facilitating and limiting factors of a managed move

DISCUSSION

The aim of this systematic review was to identify research exploring managed moves and synthesise the findings to offer greater understanding of the process than could be gained by evaluating one study. The review found a paucity in published literature on the topic. However, through including unpublished work, several themes and subthemes were identified to surmise participants' experiences of managed moves. The findings indicate that CYP who undergo a managed move can successfully integrate to a new school provided the decision is made for appropriate reasons and key considerations are made. Successful integration after a move is subject to a pupil completing a 12-week trial period at the host school in most LAs (Chadwick, 2013). In the short term, it appears managed moves may be a promising alternative to exclusion for some CYP.

Reasons for managed move

The first research question sought to determine the circumstances or contexts in which managed moves were used. Not all authors reported this in their data. A key trigger for a move was a breakdown in relationship between CYP and their teachers (Muir, 2013; Craig, 2015; Bagley and Hallam, 2016). One parent suggested their child was 'provoked' by their teacher which led to the move (Bagley and Hallam, 2016, p.213). In these cases, the managed move offered the CYP a fresh start to develop new relationships. Similar findings are reported in exclusion research; CYP who experience exclusion often identify a lack of positive relationships in their mainstream setting (Lally, 2013; Pomeroy, 1999). In one study, 60% of parents believed their child's exclusion was a direct result of a personality clash and breakdown in relationship with teachers (Hayes and Dunne, 2001).

Relationship difficulties extended to peers. Some participants cited bullying or social isolation as a trigger for a move (Harris *et al.*, 2006; Chadwick, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2016; Hoyle, 2016). In some instances, moves were initiated by CYP's family due to the pupil experiencing unhappiness or being exposed to bullying (Chadwick, 2013; Hofkins, 2007). Positive peer relationships can enhance a sense of connectedness and feeling connected to a school setting can be associated with school success (McLaughlin and Clarke, 2010). An absence of positive peer relationships may have serious short and long-term effects on physical and mental health of a CYP (Farrington and Ttofi, 2010). In some instances this can lead to secondary difficulties such as anger problems (Bagley, 2013) which may place the CYP at risk of exclusion.

Managed moves were also used where a CYP displayed behaviour difficulties which may have been linked to SEN (Harris *et al.*, 2006; Chadwick, 2013; Craig, 2015; Hoyle, 2016). For example, one pupil had a diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder and challenges with communication led to frequent behavioural outbursts (Chadwick, 2013). A Year 5 pupil with a diagnosis of ADHD and 'behavioural difficulties' was also asked to move school (Craig, 2015, p.71). This finding reflects exclusion data that shows an increased risk if the CYP has SEN (DfE, 2011). In these cases, it is possible teachers may not be aware of individual learning needs of pupils or do not feel they have appropriate resources to differentiate and cater for them. Challenging behaviour can disrupt the classroom environment and impact teacher well-being and confidence (Roffey, 2012). One parent suggested their child had been asked to move to fulfil the needs of the school rather than her child (Muir, 2013). Balancing competing needs of individuals with collective rights to education poses a dilemma to school staff (Munn and Lloyd, 2005).

It is troublesome to discover CYP experiencing difficulties with establishing and maintaining relationships with staff or peers or CYP with SEN bear rejection, in some cases repeated rejection, from schools in order that interests of the majority are met. It has been suggested managed moves

facilitate the desire to move a problem of a CYP with challenging behaviour elsewhere (Bagley, 2013). Some participants spoke of feelings of sadness (Craig, 2015), vulnerability, powerlessness (Hoyle, 2016) and rejection at being asked to leave (Muir, 2013) despite the principles of a managed move being underpinned by solution-focused thinking (Abdelnoor, 2007). Although not all participants felt this way, consideration should be given to the long-term implications of triggering these emotions.

Factors supporting successful reintegration

The second research question aimed to identify the features of a managed move associated with successful reintegration and the sub-themes can be found in *Figure 2*. All stakeholders across the nine papers referred to the importance of relationships in some form. There is a wide variety of relationship dynamics represented in *Figure 4* below.

Regardless of relationship dynamic, positive relationships at the receiving school were necessary for successful reintegration (Muir, 2013). Previous research has found positive relationships are a protective factor fundamental to successful reintegration to mainstream school from a PRU (Thomas, 2015) or vice versa (Michael and Frederickson, 2013). Teachers recognised how supportive staff relationships helped the pupil feel included, welcome and secure (Muir, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2015) and parents acknowledged this was achieved by commitment from staff (Vincent *et al.*, 2007). Crucially, for some CYP the ability to foster new relationships determined whether they viewed the placement as a success or not (Muir, 2013).

Insert Figure 4   Positive relationship dynamics for successful managed move

Having open lines of communication and a pastoral and personalised support plan for the CYP were strong in accounts from LA staff (Chadwick, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2015; Craig, 2015; Flitcroft

and Kelly, 2016). Staff felt home-school communication throughout the process was the school's responsibility (Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016) and the importance of consulting with parents at each stage of the process was highlighted (Bagley and Hallam, 2015). One LA staff member quoted that parents should, "feel that they are equal partners in the process and that their opinion is valued," (Bagley and Hallam, 2015, p.437). Parents also emphasised their responsibility in keeping good contact with the school to support their child's progress through the process (Bagley and Hallam, 2016). Overall, there was a lack of agreement on the optimal form or frequency of communication but this may be influenced by personal preference.

Many LA staff and parents reported the necessity of a pastoral and personalised support plan for the CYP to facilitate consistent support (Harris *et al.*, 2006; Chadwick, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2015; Craig, 2015; Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016). The views of staff, parents and the CYP should be considered at the beginning of the managed move process (Abdelnoor, 2007). Listening to the views of the CYP allows them to feel included as part of the decision-making process and several skills such as increased motivation, independence and perception of personal control are associated with pupil participation (Roller, 1998). These views can also be represented as part of their personalised plan for transition but may also highlight the importance of accessing education throughout the process. An awareness of the pupil's strengths and needs is necessary at the start of the process (Chadwick, 2013) in order to tailor the plan (Flitcroft and Kelly, 2016). A pastoral support plan can include agreements for pragmatic matters but should also state ways in which CYP will be supported to develop relationships with new staff and peers. The CYPs need to belong should be met by this plan (Hoyle, 2016). From the data, it was unclear how much input CYP had to their transition plan but one LA officer identified the need for more pupil voice (Craig, 2015). In accordance with Article 12 of the UNCRC, CYP's views must be considered and taken seriously in matters that concern them (UNCRC, 1989) therefore involving their views, wishes and goals as part of the plan should feature in every transition during a managed move.

Overall, this review identified a wide variety of experiences leading to a range of positive outcomes for CYP. Most frequently reported were; a fresh start for the CYP, the development of new, positive relationships, improved progress and learning, greater emotional well-being and behaviour in line with expected norms.

Difficulties associated with a managed move

Two key difficulties with the managed move process were identified by CYP, their parents and LA staff; poor communication and family stress. School staff raised a strong concern they could not always access clear guidelines from the LA on best practice for implementing a managed move and did not know how to access support (Chadwick, 2013). Furthermore, poor communication between professionals about the CYP's needs hindered the process and opened up inter-school tensions (Bagley and Hallam, 2015). Poor communication also affected CYP. One pupil stated, "…they weren't trying to help me, it was just another group of people like looking down on me trying to tell me off…," (Hoyle, 2016, p.90). This suggests for this YP there was a lack of communication about the purpose of the managed move. A managed move should not proceed without the explicit consent of the CYP and their parents (Abdelnoor, 2007; DfE, 2004). This requires an agreement which is clearly communicated in pupil-friendly language outlining the opportunity for the CYP to make a fresh start (Abdelnoor, 2007). Staff should be clear the pupil can fully understand and consent to the process.

A second challenge raised by parents is stress on family members from the start of the move until successful transition (Chadwick, 2013; Muir, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2016). To ensure parents were well informed, a high level of active involvement was required. Some parents spoke of adopting LA roles to ensure they were kept well-informed (Muir, 2013; Bagley and Hallam, 2016)

and to avoid relinquishing control over their children's futures (Muir, 2013). The level of resilience required to advocate for their children took its toll on some participants, one parent highlighted being outnumbered by professionals was overwhelming at times and demonstrated concern for parents who would be unable to "fight the battle," (Chadwick, 2013, p.81). Another parent spoke of the stress caused by the disempowerment of being told to accept a move or have their child face exclusion (Muir, 2013). In addition, CYP appeared reliant on their parents for support and knowledge placing further demands on parental resilience.

Although a range of positive short-term outcomes for the CYP were identified it is important to note that parental and CYP views were fluid throughout the process. Significantly, CYPs emotional well-being appeared to fluctuate with their feelings of social connectedness. For example, if a CYP was distressed at leaving their friends at their starter school they would experience sadness until establishing a peer network in their new school (Craig, 2015). Research has indicated that CYP's well-being should be considered at key transition points such as entry to Year 7 or Year 10 and the need to listen to pupil voice at these times (McCluskey, 2008).

The following recommendations for future managed moves are:

- Clear guidelines on the managed move process should be provided by the LA or Academy Trust.
- CYP should be considered at the centre of the process with a focus on their strengths.
- A personalised or pastoral support plan should be co-constructed between professionals, the CYP and their parents.
- Good communication should be promoted to foster positive relationships.
- Parents should be offered support from external services during the process.

Strengths and limitations

This review fills a research gap by focusing exclusively on using managed moves as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools. Using qualitative data, views are offered from representatives from each stakeholder group. The synthesis has drawn on these multiple perspectives to offer an inclusive picture of the managed move process. By including 'grey' literature, the chance the review has been affected by publication bias has been reduced.

As with any systematic review, despite using exhaustive search methods it is not possible to conclude all relevant studies were found, particularly as other terminology may be used for a managed move. Little is known about the LAs in which the studies took place therefore, this review cannot offer a comprehensive picture of how managed moves are being used across the country and practice appears to vary widely. There is reason to believe managed moves would not be as effective in all LAs due to geographical location. For example, in rural Shropshire the nearest school may be 25 miles away meaning a managed move would either be impractical or cause further inconvenience to the family (Evans, 2010). In addition, the context regarding free schools and academies has changed rapidly in recent years, with a reduction in LA maintained schools. All the research reviewed was conducted in LA schools therefore the way in which the process may take place within an Academy Trust or a free school has not been represented here.

The participants in these studies had been recruited within a year of their managed move. Consequently, this review offers no insight into the long-term outcomes for the CYP. It is possible if the needs of the CYP are not addressed in their new school, difficulties may begin to manifest over time.

Future research in this area may want to adopt a realist synthesis approach to provide explanations for why managed moves may or may not work, in what contexts, how and in what circumstances (Pawson *et al*., 2005). The logic of this approach allows theory to be developed to inform policy about evidence for situations where managed moves may be more likely to be effective.

Furthermore, future research could identify whether the success of a managed move is likely to be influenced by CYP gender or age, size of school or type of school (eg, free school, LA maintained or academy).

CONCLUSION

This review has explored the reasons a CYP may be asked to move schools, factors which contribute to the success of a move, associated difficulties and the impact the move has on stakeholders. A positive managed move requires several key considerations to be made and relies profoundly on complex relationships being developed. The benefits of effective integration following a managed move were viewed as providing the CYP with a fresh start and this may enable the process to be a successful alternative to exclusion. The review has considered how the CYP must be placed at the centre of the process and the importance of schools focusing on the facilitating factors. If successful integration following a move is to be achieved, the positive practice as recommended in this review should be shared with LAs and Academy Trusts to be included within protocols to provide schools with a clear process to follow. This review has synthesised evidence from nine papers, contributing to knowledge of exclusion and managed moves. Clearly, further research into the managed move process is required and it would be most beneficial to collect data on the long-term outcomes of CYP to conclude that the move is an enduring successful alternative to exclusion.

REFERENCES

Abdelnoor, A. (2007) *Managed Moves*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Adams, R. (2015) English schools see first rise in exclusions in eight years. Available at:

https://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/jul/30/english-schools-see-first-rise-in-exclusions-in-eight-years (Accessed: 25th November 2016)

Bagley, C. (2013) '"*Pass the Parcel". Are managed moves an effective intervention? Is there a role for Educational Psychologists in facilitating the process*?' Unpublished Thesis.

Bagley, C. and Hallam, S. (2015) 'Managed moves: school and local authority staff perceptions of processes, success and challenges', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 20(4), pp. 432–447.

Bagley, C. and Hallam, S. (2016) 'Young people's and parent's perceptions of managed moves', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 21(2), pp. 205–227.

Boeije, H. R., Van Wesel, F. and Alisic, E. (2011) 'Making a difference: Towards a method for weighing the evidence in a qualitative synthesis', *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 17(4), pp. 657–663.

Boland, A., Cherry, G., and Dickson, R. (2013) *Doing a Systematic Review*. London: SAGE.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). pp. 77-101.

British Psychological Society. (2017) Behaviour Change: School attendance, , exclusion and persistent absence. Available at: http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/education.pdf (Accessed: 23rd January, 2017).

Centre for Social Justice. (2011). *No Excuses: A Review of Educational Exclusion*. London: Centre for Social Justice.

Chadwick, M. (2013) *An exploration of the effectiveness of the 'managed move' protocol to support the integration of secondary aged pupils*. Unpublished Thesis.

Craig, S. (2015) *Storying experiences of managed moves: an interations-performative analysis*. Unpublished Thesis.

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2016). 10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research. Available at: http://www.casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists. (Accessed: 14 November, 2016).

Daniels, H. (2011). "Exclusion from School and Its Consequences." *Psychological Science and Education*, (1), pp. 38–50.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). (2010). *Guidance on School Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships*. London: DfES Publications.

Department for Education (DfE). (2016a) *Permanent and Fixed Period Exclusions in England : 2014 to 2015*.

Department for Education. (2016b). *Educational Excellence Everywhere.* Crown Publishing

Department for Education (DfE). (2015). *Behaviour and discipline in schools*. Crown Publishing.

Department for Education (DfE). (2011). *Reasons for Exclusion from School*. School of Education: University of Leicester.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2003). *Every Child Matters*. London: HMSO

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2004). *Improving attendance and behaviour. Guidance on exclusion from schools and Pupil Referral Units.* London: DfES Publications.

Dixon-Woods, M., Sutton, A., Shaw, R., Miller, T., Smith, J, Young, B., Bonas, S., Booth, A. and Jones, D. (2007) 'Appraising qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews : a quantitative and qualitative comparison of three methods', *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 12(1), pp. 42–47.

Education Act. (1986) *The Education Act (No.2)*. London: The Stationary Office.

Evans, J. (2010) *Not present and not correct: Understanding and preventing school exclusions*. Barnardo's Report.

Farrington, D. P. and Ttofi, M. M. (2010) 'School-Based Programs to Reduce Bullying and Victimization', *The Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group*, 6, pp. 1–147.

Flitcroft, D. and Kelly, C. (2016) 'An appreciative exploration of how schools create a sense of belonging to facilitate the successful transition to a new school for pupils involved in a managed move', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 21(3), pp. 301–313.

Fox, S., and Ashmore, Z. (2014). Multisystemic therapy as an intervention to prevent young people entering the care system. *British Journal of Social Work*. 45(7), pp. 1-17.

Gazeley, L. and Marrable, T. (2015) 'Contextualising inequalities in rates of school exclusion in English schools: beneath the 'tip of the ice-berg'', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 63(4), pp. 487–504.

Gazeley, L., Marrable, T., Brown, C. and Boddy, J. (2013) *Reducing inequalities in school exclusion: learning from good practice*.

Hannes, K. (2011) Critical appraisal of qualitative research. In: Noyes, J., Booth A, Hannes, K., Harden, A., Harris, J., Lewin, S., Lockwood, C. (eds), *Supplementary Guidance for Inclusion of Qualitative Research in Cochrane Systematic Reviews of Interventions.* Available from URL http://cqrmg.cochrane.org/supplemental-handbook-guidance

Harding, E. and Atkinson, C. (2009) 'How EPs record the Voice of the Child', *Bury Educational Psychology Service*, pp. 1–30.

Harris, B., Vincent, K., Thomson, P. and Toalster, R. (2006) 'Does every child know they matter? Pupils' views of one alternative to exclusion', *Pastoral Care*, pp. 28–38.

Hayes, C. & Dunne, S. (2001). *Outside Looking in: Children and Families Experiences of Social Exclusion*. London: The Children's Society.

Hayes, B., Richardson, S., Hindle, S. and Grayson, K. (2011) 'Developing teaching assistants' skills in positive behaviour management: an application of Video Interaction Guidance in a secondary school', *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 27(3), pp. 255–269.

Hirsch, A. (2015). Academies 'illegally excluding' vulnerable pupils. Available at: http://news.sky.com/story/academies-illegally-excluding-vulnerable-pupils-10340315 (Accessed: 28th November, 2016).

Hofkins, D. (2007). One Last Chance. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2007/dec/11/pupilbehaviour.schools (Accessed: 9th January 2017).

Hoyle, K. (2016) *Secondary school pupils' experiences of managed moves: An interpretative phenomenological analysis*. Unpublished Thesis.

Kane, G. A., Wood, V. A. and Barlow, J. (2007) 'Parenting programmes: A systematic review and synthesis of qualitative research', *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 33(6), pp. 784–793.

Lally, S. (2013). *School Exclusion and Reintegration: An Exploration of Pupils', Parents' and Teachers' Experiences.* Unpublished Thesis.

Learning and Skills Act (2000) Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/21/pdfs/ukpga_20000021_en.pdf (Accessed: 25th April, 2017)

Lewis, B. (2016). So why are there no academy schools in Wales? Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-35821725 (Accessed: 25th April, 2017)

McCluskey, G. (2008). Exclusion from school: What can 'included' pupils tell us? *British Educational Research Journal* 34 (4), pp. 447 – 466.

McLaughlin, C. and Clarke, B. (2010) 'Relational matters: A review of the impact of school experience on mental health in early adolescence.', *Educational and Child Psychology*, 27(1), pp. 91–103.

Michael, S. and Frederickson, N. (2013) 'Improving pupil referral unit outcomes: pupil perspectives', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 18(4), pp. 407–422.

Michail, S. (2011) 'Understanding school responses to students' challenging behaviour: A review of literature', *Improving Schools*, 14(2), pp. 156–171.

Mickenautsch, S. (2010) 'Systematic reviews, systematic error and the acquisition of clinical knowledge.', *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 10(53), pp. 1-7.

Morrison, B. (2006) 'School Bullying and Restorative Justice: Toward a Theoretical Understanding of the Role of Respect, Pride, and Shame', *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(2), pp. 371–393.

Muir, P. (2013) *Stakeholders ' Experiences of the Managed Transfer Process for Pupils with Social Emotional and Behavioural Needs : An Exploratory IPA Study*. Unpublished Thesis.

Munn, P. and Lloyd, G. (2005) 'Exclusion and Excluded Pupils', *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), pp. 205–221.

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2011). "*They never give up on you*". School Exclusions Inquiry. OCC

OFSTED. (2010). Children missing from education. Ofsted, Manchester

Pane, D. M., Rocco, T. S., Miller, L. D. and Salmon, A. K. (2014) 'How Teachers Use Power in the Classroom to Avoid or Support Exclusionary School Discipline Practices', *Urban Education*, 49(3), pp. 297–328.

Parsons, C. (2005) 'School Exclusion: The Will to Punish', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(2), pp. 187–211.

Parsons, C. (2009) *Strategic alternatives to exclusion from school. Revised and updated edition*. London: Institute of Education Press.

Pawson, R., Greenhalgh, T., Harvey, G., Walshe, K. (2005). Realist review - a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. Journal of Health Service Research Policy. 10, pp. 21-34.

Pomeroy, E. (1999) 'The Teacher-Student Relationship in Secondary School : Insights from Excluded Students Author', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(4), pp. 465–482.

Rhodes, E. (2017). 5 minutes with…Vivian Hill. Available at:
https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-30/march-2017/5-minutes-vivian-hill (Accessed 13th February, 2017).

Roffey, S. (2012) 'Pupil wellbeing -Teacher wellbeing: Two sides of the same coin?', *Educational and Child Psychology*, 29(4), pp. 8–17.

Sellman, E., Bedward, J., Cole, T, and Daniels, H. (2002). Thematic Review. A socio-cultural approach to exclusion. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28, (6), pp. 890-899.

Solomon, B. G., Klein, S. A., Hintze, J. M., Cressey, J. M. and Peller, Sarah, L. (2012) 'A meta-analysis of school-wide positive behavior support: An exploratory study using single case-synthesis', *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(2), pp. 105–121.

Spink, L. A. (2011) *Disciplinary exclusion: The impact of intervention and influence of school ethos*. Unpublished Thesis.

Thomas, D. V. (2015) 'Factors affecting successful reintegration', *Educational Studies*, 41(1–2), pp. 188–208.

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child.* Geneva: United Nations.

Vincent, K., Harris, B., Thomson, P. and Toalster, R. (2007) 'Managed moves: schools collaborating for collective gain', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 12(4), pp. 283–298.