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This document is presented as a Draft for Consultation following the Heads Workshop on the 6th June.

The discussion was wide-ranging and some important observations were made and ideas discussed. This document serves both as a record of the key points made but also takes us the first few steps towards developing and delivering a coherent AP strategy for the city.

The final section includes some proposed immediate next steps so we can begin implementation without delay.

It would be most helpful to have feedback from schools and local authority colleagues by the **end of June 2018** so some of the proposed work can start and a fuller strategy and Delivery Plan can be drafted before the Summer break.
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1. **Introduction**

The Heads Workshop on the 6th June began with a bit of context around:

* The DfE new AP Policy published in March
* The findings of the mapping exercise of current AP provision in the city (using a wide definition of AP and including strategies to reduce demand for AP)
* The findings of the Lead Links Workshop
* Our bid to the DfE AP Innovation Fund
* The financial situation regarding AP

The rest of the workshop was structured around the 'tiered model' we have developed and centred on three key questions:

1. What is working well
2. What are the challenges
3. What should it look like in 2021
4. **Principles informing our strategy for AP**

It is possible to extrapolate from the conversation an emerging set of principles to inform the strategy over the next 3 years.

1. School to school collaboration - schools (and the local authority) working together (through the PEP and Phase Heads Conferences) to share practice and strategically commission high quality AP
2. Multi-agency collaboration - organising external agencies to ensure appropriate support for vulnerable children and support for inclusive practice schools
3. Curriculum - getting the curriculum right for children is critical in raising attendance, improving behaviour and reducing demand for AP
4. Prevention - identifying and addressing child and family need at the earliest point and in particular when children approach transition points
5. Professional development - having a planned and structured approach to building the skills, knowledge and competence of teachers, pastoral staff and AP specialists
6. Consistency - moving to a shared approach and model of practice in the city and a shared language
7. Inclusion - enabling children to be included in mainstream classrooms wherever possible including reintegration after periods of AP
8. **Structuring our Strategy**

It is suggested that our strategy has two objectives:

1. Managing demand for AP - improving school and multi-agency impact on children's behaviour and learning and reducing the need for higher tier, higher cost provision
2. Collaboratively commissioning and delivering excellent alternative provision that enables young people to make progress and achieve successful transitions to post-16 education, employment or training.
3. **Key Points from Schools**

The two objectives above echo the debate at the Heads Workshop in June and the contribution of Lead Links in the earlier session in May.

The following key points have been made by schools.

1. **Managing Demand for AP**
   1. **What is working well?**
2. Significant innovation in schools, especially around on-site provision, in school behaviour support and developing work on emotional health and wellbeing
3. Many examples of good Year 6 - Year 7 transition work
4. Alternative exclusions
5. CAMHS drop-ins are valued
6. Support from MABS and Educational Psychology are highly valued
7. Effective behaviour for learning policies
8. Evidence of effective whole school work on culture and ethos including early examples of effective practice on models such as restorative practice
9. Talented staff working on behaviour and mental health support (ELSAs, pastoral teams etc).
10. Some really effective mentoring models in place e.g. Girls Network
    1. **What are the Challenges?**
11. School staff having to do more and more pastoral work in response to cuts in city services over the years
12. School budgets stretched and challenged in sustaining the number of pastoral staff and having them appropriately supervised and managed
13. Parental expectations of what schools will/can do regarding child mental health
14. External services closing cases due to lack of engagement of the family - yet the school can’t 'walk away'
15. Current challenging Year 4 cohort
16. Some Year 7 pupils arrive at secondary schools in September with little or no previous information
17. CAMHS appear to place unrealistic expectations of what a school can put in place for an individual child
18. Are we completely clear why children end up in on-site units - have we heard the voice of children in our planning?
19. School funding changes are about to significantly impact on some of our primary schools in areas of high deprivation
    1. **What should we have in place for 2021?**
20. A coherent, structured professional development programme for all staff in schools, sufficiently bespoked for different audiences - teachers, pastoral staff and staff in on-site units and AP providers
21. Coherency in the support for whole-school work on behaviour for learning from external agencies (EPs, Special Schools/Harbour, Teaching Schools, CAMHS etc)
22. A cross-city network of managers/leaders of on-site provision to share good and effective practice
23. A shared approach - model of practice - and language in the city (e.g. restorative, PACE)
24. A range of effective mentoring programmes for children
25. **Commissioning and Providing Excellent AP**
    1. **What is working well?**
26. The Harbour school appears to be about the right size - balancing the level of need with the funding available
27. Flying Bull resource is effective
28. Significant expertise in Harbour and Flying Bull to draw on
29. Schools (including the Virtual School) have developed a range of creative and flexible learning opportunities for vulnerable children
30. Some schools working together already to commission other providers - e.g. recent work around Motiv8 and engagement with the University (Portsmouth Scholars)
    1. **What are the Challenges**
31. Ofsted are now increasingly interested in outcomes for children on the roll of mainstream being education elsewhere
32. Take up of Short Stay School has been limited
33. There is no clear sense across all schools of what is on offer, how much it costs and what the outcomes for children might be
34. Individual schools are left negotiating with external providers
35. Flexibility in Key Stage 3 curriculum is underdeveloped
36. The National Curriculum is not affording the flexible modular learning packages that once (in the days of 14 - 19 curriculum development) allowed vulnerable children to achieve
37. Reintegration is not working well enough
38. There is a waiting list for Harbour (albeit not huge and closely managed). May be more an issue of 'lead in' time.
    1. **What should we have in place for 2021?**
39. A clear, up-to-date directory/prospectus of alternative provision including costs, courses, expected outcomes utilising the Local Offer and/or PEP website
40. A model of 'distributed but co-ordinated' commissioning of alternative providers across Key Stage 2 - 4 with the following features:
    * Lead Links taking responsibility between them and on behalf of the city (recognising this requires (i) some schools to reshape their Lead Link's role and (ii) there has to be effective reporting into Secondary Heads)[[1]](#footnote-1)
    * Putting in place a mechanism to not just 'purchase off a directory' but to engage with providers in advance to bespoke programmes of learning.
    * Enabling medium term assurance of the number of placements expected in an academic year (recognising the challenge that sometimes children return in September more willing to engage in mainstream)
    * Shared responsibility for quality assurance to reduce burden on Lead Links
41. Improved parenting support programmes (e.g. Non-violent Resistance, Triple P etc.)
42. **An Early Summary of the Strategy and Next Steps**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Medium/Long-Term Ambition** | **Next Immediate Steps** | | |
| **What** | **By When** | **By Whom** |
| 1. Managing Demand | 1.1 A coherent, structured professional development pathway for all staff in education settings | Workshop of current training providers to map provision and outline a professional development pathway based on skills, knowledge and competencies | August 2018 | Sarah Christopher et al as part of Inclusion Group's work on Emotional Health and Well-being Strategy |
| 1.2 Shared language and model of practice for working with children at risk of and in AP | Consideration of PACE model - within the context of Restorative Practice - at Phase Heads conferences | Autumn 2018 | Ian Hunkin and Hayden Ginns (linked to DfE Bid ambitions) |
| 1.3 Clear, high quality school improvement offer for behaviour support | Mapping of current offer including traded offer, partnership offer, Special School offer, provision from Multi- Academy Providers and Teaching School | Sep 2018 | Julia Katherine et al - integrate this work into development of the SEND Hub |
| 1.4 Good practice network for managers/leaders of on-site school provision | Identify the relevant staff in each of the 8 schools with on-site provision through Lead Links network | Sep 2018 | Neil Stevenson and Lead Links |
| 1.5 CAMHS provision that supports inclusion and provides effective in-school support | Meet with CAMHS providers and commissioners to scope current provision and capacity for reshaping in-school provision. | Aug 2018 | Hayden Ginns |
| 1.6 Effective range of mentoring opportunities | Mapping of current providers - aims, objectives and resources | Aug 2018 | Sarah Christopher |
| 1.7 Effective and accessible parenting programmes for families of children at risk of or on AP | Review development and offer on Parenting Pathway and consider options for expansion | Aug 2018 | Kate Slater and Hayden Ginns |
| 1.8 Consistently effective transition arrangements for Yr 6 - Yr 7 | Gather evidence of good and effective practice and disseminate to Heads | July 2018 | Neil Stevenson and Lead Links |
| 1.9 Support and curriculum for pupils that reflects their views and experiences | Consider mechanism for consultation/participation of pupils in on-site units and other AP settings | Sep 2018 | Julia Katherine through existing co-production structures |
| 1. Commissioning and Providing Excellent Alternative Provision | 2.1 A clear, consistent and up-to-date prospectus of AP options as part of the Local Offer | Write to all providers of AP to request information on provision, costs and capacity to engage in the AP Commissioning-Provider Group | July 2018 | Hayden Ginns |
| 2.2 School-led AP Commissioning-Provider Group made up of Lead Links and AP providers | Initial scoping meeting with Lead Links leading to clear Terms of Reference, accountability, chairing and commissioning responsibilities  Heads to ensure Lead Links are aware of this enhancement to their role | July 2018 | Neil Stevenson  Secondary Heads |
| 2.3 Improved use of Short Stay school and reintegration support | Ensure all schools have up-to-date information on Short Stay School option and reintegration expectation  Refresh the SEMH Pupil and Curriculum Pathway | July 2018  Sep 2018 | Ian Hunkin and Lead Links  Neil Stevenson and Lead Links |

**Appendix 1**

**Portsmouth Tiered Model for Alternative Provision**

**4. Harbour School and Flying Bull Inclusion Centre**

**3. Alternative Provision on another site**

**2. 'Alternative Provision' in school**

**1. Whole school ethos/approaches, behaviour management & support** (i.e. preventing AP)

Including: a) High quality teaching and learning, curriculum development

b) Multi-agency support from external partners (CAMHs, MABs etc)

E.g. on-site 'units', inclusion rooms etc. (excluding LA commissioned SEND Inclusion Centres)

e.g. positive activities, work experience, college placements.

(including Full-time AP places, Short Stay School, Near to School)

1. There was little desire amongst Heads to invest in a AP commissioner to work on behalf of all schools [↑](#footnote-ref-1)