

## Appendix 4

### High Needs Task and Finish Group

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2019 at 10.30 am

Housman Room, Shirehall

#### Present:

John Hitchings, Bill Dowell, David O'Toole, Chris Kerry, Greg Portman, Garry Dean, Kerry Lynch, Alan Parkhurst, Andrew Smith, Ed Potter, Julia Dean, Phil Wilson, Connor Robinson, Helen Woodbridge

#### Apologies

Stephen Waters, Jane Parsons, Claire Gaskin, Reuben Thorley, Sonia Taylor, Karen Ladd

1	<b>Welcome and introductions</b> John Hitchings welcomed everyone
2	<b>Minutes and Matters arising (if not already on agenda)</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2019 were accepted as a true record. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Julia Dean proposed longer term work (over a year) to sit with Chris Kerry and the 0-25 SEND Board. This would be reported back to Schools Forum (where there are financial implications) in around one year's time.</li><li>• Work around the Timpson Review is ongoing.</li><li>• GD had contacted DfE regarding the behaviour training pilot. This will be set up in 2020 and they will keep GD informed.</li><li>• FAP paperwork had been addressed by Jane Parsons.</li><li>• A paper had been taken to Schools Forum.</li><li>• <b>No comments had been received on the draft high needs protocol – this will be a major agenda item at the next meeting.</b></li><li>• The response to the call for evidence had been submitted.</li></ul>
3	<b>Results from Alternative Provision Survey of Schools</b> CR had worked on this and introduced his paper. There had been a disappointing response rate from schools with 35% secondary and 15% primary. John Hitchings wondered if the possible increase in funding may have an impact on this. CR took colleagues through his report. Although there was not a full response, he felt that there was a balance of schools. <b>Intervention</b> Schools were overwhelmingly positive re TMBSS intervention. There was some concern re some effectiveness on return to mainstream. Limited space at TMBSS. Some influence is from the support of parents. JD concerned re suggestion that it reduces rates of exclusion as it is not necessarily the answer. DO maybe feedback is from only those who access the service – others are frustrated. JD highlighted the need to consider those cases where TMBSS was not accessed and then the pupil was excluded. JH asked about the activity of this group linking to other agencies. He was advised that Karen Ladd from Early Help (EH) sits on this group. It was agreed that joint working with limited resources is key. JD added that parental engagement at the first level is important. GP flagged up the post placement aspect too. DO suggested the need to end up with an SLA for schools to buy in to – the whole process should be built in.

### **Financial Contribution**

Regarding the section around schools being willing to make a financial contribution to access the service there was split response – 54% would, 46% wouldn't.

CR had contacted other LAs and he talked through their responses which show a real mixed situation in terms of who pays and the level of top up. Other LAs are also considering this issue.

KL wondered asked about length of time – could some be full time rather than part time?

It was noted that some LAs do not provide AP and some are disbanding PRUs.

CK advised that the top three councils with highest AP costs are Stoke, Essex and Northumberland, whilst Barnet, Stoke, Redcar and Cleveland have the highest costs for LA AP using private providers.

JH reminded colleagues that the provision is not statutory – there is a need to consider if it should continue to be provided.

It was confirmed that the budget for next year is planned but some issues are not foreseeable.

DO was concerned that none of the information takes into account other AP that schools buy. His view is the idea of notional budgets is not satisfactory. He would consider working together with other schools to provide AP as a stage before.

CK suggested that the LA need to consider managed moves with protection for schools.

JD added that those schools with low rates of PEx make managed moves.

AP spoke of the high mobility rate. His school always takes children and would like managed moves with funding as the budget situation is dire.

GD referred to the National Audit Office report 11/9 - notional budget being reviewed.

<https://www.nao.org.uk/report/support-for-pupils-with-special-educational-needs-and-disabilities/>

KL spoke of disparity between schools in what they are spending funds on.

### **Models**

#### **Primary**

GP could understand some of the concerns but there were no surprises.

CK suggested that the work of her new officers will dovetail with TMBSS.

AP advised of the capacity issue for schools and thought that a standard funded offer would be good. More behaviour training is required.

CK suggested sharing experience across schools.

AS suggested that in his experience, staff training has been very beneficial.

JD advised that many pupils have attachment issues and there is free training around this available from the Virtual School.

GD added the need to use Early Help if necessary to address behaviour issues earlier.

AP had concerns around the inconsistency of Early Help. Poor parenting is an issue.

He advised that he had accessed EAS inclusion officers successfully.

It was noted that schools appreciate the work of the inclusion officers (funded from high needs block). CK advised that there will also be a lead teacher for vulnerable pupils.

JD advised that EPS has an offer of ELSA training.

**GD agreed to produce a list of schools that have not accessed attachment training.**

CK highlighted a secondary cost to high needs block re contextual safeguarding (and there is often no SEND).

AP suggested that this is also filtering down to primary.

CK advised of free exploitation training which is being rolled out. **HW to check with Corinne Chidley.**

	<p>JD advised that the case studies from David O’Toole had been reviewed and need to be fed into CK’s group. At least two of the children were at risk of CSE before they had attended SJT.</p> <p><b>Secondary</b>  Model 1 most popular  Model 2 50/50  Model 3 least popular.</p> <p><b>Outreach</b>  GP took on board outreach issues (which will be a stretch for TMBSS staff) and the KS4 concerns re GSCE. Overall, responses were as expected.  DO thought that brokering/consideration by inclusion officer is valuable.  GP felt that Shropshire is missing a centralised vocational option which would make the students more employable. A vocational placement with PRU that schools could buy into would be positive.  It was suggested that the new Ofsted framework may make a difference.  BD asked about engagement with colleges. GP advised that this is limited and difficult, particularly where there are extreme behaviour issues.  CK felt that the 14-19 curriculum offer is not being embraced by colleges.  BD suggested that college funding will be the issue, but encouraged colleagues to keep engaging as the facilities are good.  GP agreed that outreach would be a stretch but the benefits outweigh the negatives. The right people are needed at the right time and it needs to be a two-way process.  JD advised that Woodlands are restructuring their outreach.  GP felt that Woodlands address the more extreme end so may not be the right service for many.  JD highlighted the need to use expertise across hubs.  GD added that there is some good practice developing in the hubs.  KL suggested that targeted support to individuals works best.  GD spoke of the graduated approach and was worried that sometimes the assessment part is skipped.</p>
4	<p><b>Next steps</b></p> <p>It was agreed that more examples of models should be put together to consult further. Schools Forum could consider next month. There was some question as to whether the Schools Funding Meeting on 14 November would be the right group to consult with.</p> <p>JD agreed to include models with and without contributions.  BD spoke of the moving picture re funding. It may be that there will be a little extra to support this.  JH reminded colleagues that schools would need to understand costs by budget setting time (June).  BD asked about managed moves.  CK advised that the LA stance has always been against. However, now exclusions have grown (and it is happening anyway), she would like to look at this as an option. She added that some LAs take funding from schools as a levy.  JD highlighted some of the advantages. AWPU would go from school losing pupil.  JD suggested the need to go through Schools Forum if any charges are to be made.  AP felt that this issue needs to be tackled and LA should force schools.  CK identified EHE changes and the prospect of children being moved back into school.  BD requested a paper for 7 November Schools Forum</p>

	<p>CK advised of the need for 'buy in' from all headteachers but was conscious of a minority who resist.</p> <p>AP suggested that an admin cost for a managed move could be charged to the losing school.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be better to get headteachers involved early.</p> <p>JD added that currently the LA don't place students in some schools as suspect they would fail – she highlighted the need to upskill school staff.</p> <p>AP suggested telling schools that they can't be helped unless eg attachment training has been done etc.</p> <p>BD thought that the easy option (exclusion) should be taken away.</p> <p>AP spoke of grey exclusions and schools not using the GSP – he felt that some schools are not taking action early enough.</p>
5	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Helen Woodbridge to arrange a meeting for officers/Greg Portman. This has now been done by JD</p>
6	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>15 October 2019 10.30 –at Wilfred Owen School.</p> <p>Apologies for this meeting were received from Bill Dowell.</p>

**High Needs Task and Finish Group**  
**Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 at 10.30 - 12.05**  
**Wilfred Owen Primary School**

**Present:**

John Hitchings, Chris Kerry, Garry Dean, Kerry Lynch, Alan Parkhurst, Andrew Smith, Julia Dean, Stephen Waters, Rose Hooper, Helen Woodbridge

1	<p><b>Welcome and introductions</b>          John Hitchings welcomed everyone</p>
2	<p><b>Apologies</b>          Apologies had been received from Bill Dowell, David O’Toole, Jane Parsons, Greg Portman, Ed Potter, Claire Gaskin, Reuben Thorley, Karen Ladd, Phil Wilson and Sonia Taylor</p>
3	<p><b>Minutes and Matters arising (if not already on agenda)</b>          The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2019 were accepted as a true record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High needs protocol is an agenda item.</li> <li>• RH agreed to advise of schools that have not accessed attachment as she has been collating this information.</li> <li>• HW had checked on exploitation training – this had been sent to schools via the weekly email.</li> <li>• BD had requested a paper for 7 November Schools Forum – CK advised that this has been overtaken by other work – she will check further with BD/PW.</li> <li>• The meeting between officers and Greg Portman has taken place.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Alternative Provision Consultation - Next steps</b></p> <p>Following the meeting of officers (JD, CK, GD) with GP, JD had started to formulate key headings. A three page document was circulated at meeting.</p> <p>AP At 2.3, queried the exclusion of children at risk of exclusion (which is in other papers). JD advised that it not been included as it is not statutory but the assumption is that high needs funding would be spent on this.</p> <p>It was agreed that TMBSS is occasionally a destination but more normally a temporary measure and this should include Y11 (in line with new Ofsted framework.) Principle is that children should be educated in mainstream schools.</p> <p>RH asked about dual registration. JD was keen to keep this aspect as schools will access AWPU which could then be used to support the high needs block.</p> <p>AP suggested that the LA could base commissioned places on what schools had used previously and then recharge schools.</p> <p>Headlines at 3,4 and 5 need fleshing out.</p> <p>Length of intervention – headteachers felt this would be different for each child. AP suggested a panel role and this was agreed (including looking at how school had been involved).</p> <p>AP thought panel would need to have expectations of what would have been done.</p> <p>GD suggested a re-admission plan for reintegration could be created, also a contract (eg who does EHCP review, who pays for EP report, expectations of corporate parent) would be in place and a financial check would be required.</p> <p>JD would like to plan pathways for access.</p> <p>JH mentioned managed moves (but accountability needs to be with original school).</p> <p>AP suggested that the Admissions team are causing a problem by placing pupils in</p>

	<p>willing schools too often. They need to be involved.  It was agreed that if a school took a pupil who had previously been excluded they would not be financial penalised if they did not succeed.  It was agreed that it would be best if any proxy indicators were developed locally.  AP wondered if inclusive schools who were prepared to admit pupils from TMBSS could have a contract with funding?  AP and KL confirmed that the balance of classes dictates whether children can be accepted.  CK suggested that there is sometimes a training need to enable some schools to engage.</p> <p><b>Other options</b>  RH advised that some schools don't access even free training.  Colleagues suggested that they need challenge from School Improvement (SC)  There should also be questions from panel if there is no training.  NQT conference – why were SEN team not consulted re conference.  GD advised that there is disparity across county in terms of SENCos.  Centralised list of AP – to be consulted on – would schools want LA to QC? AP suggested perhaps a half way point. LA provide specification and schools check that it is in place.  JH involvement of governors an issue. Overworked and undervalued. Joint training for heads and governors would be good.  JD to work on document for next meeting – she will email colleagues on various sections. Aim to be out for consultation in January with implementation from April 2020.  GD suggested that work will need to be done after the results of the consultation but details will not be known until then.  Outreach to be made clear that it is not 1:1.  SAW requested information re cost of places including transport costs.</p>
5	<p><b>High Needs Protocol</b></p> <p>Audience? JD Local offer? SAW confirmed that the funding information is public. However, the group agreed that this document will be for professionals only.  Purpose? KL - to enable headteachers to understand.  Level of detail? KL Useful to have information included as enables understanding.  JD suggested that some development of the document will depend on government decisions around funding.  The group were happy with the document so far.  JH OOC placement costs included? JD advised that a general statement including national figures would be included.  JD to continue developing document. SAW to add in financial information.  Agreed it should be a short sharp document rather than include the process information as contained the Northamptonshire example. Aim for review at the 28 November 2019.</p>
6	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>There was no other business</p>
	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>28 November 2019</p>