Cambridgeshire SEMH Review

Cambridgeshire Primary Heads Conference 22\textsuperscript{nd} November 2018

Helen Redding - Education Consultant
Purpose of review

- to identify the level of sustainable provision required to meet SEMH need in Cambridgeshire
- review the appropriate use of out of county SEMH provision and build this into advice around requirements for SEMH provision in Cambridgeshire
- to offer recommendations on ensuring consistent high quality specialist SEMH education
- to ensure this is in the context of demographic growth in the county
Scope of review

- SEMH Provision - Harbour, Unity, Centre school
- Requirement for local SEMH Primary Provision
- Provision required from LA from BAIP
- LA use of Independent Specialist SEMH Schools and other out of county provision to meet SEMH needs
- Individual Tuition Packages
- 14-16 College Courses
- Managed moves
- EHE where the child has an identified SEND need
- Exclusions and attendance data
- Use of AP
- NEET
Intended outcomes

- Children and young people with this area of need will have their needs identified early and accurately.
- Clear evidence based guidance will support settings, schools and professionals in meeting children and young people’s needs.
- Parents and carers will feel confident that local provision will meet their child’s needs.
- Settings and schools will be confident in meeting the needs of children and young people who have behaviour that is challenging, and know where to get the right help when they need it which supports them in meeting the needs of the children and young people.
- A range of provision will be in place across Cambridgeshire that reflects the context of that district and enables children and young people’s needs to be met as locally as possible.
- The core offer and admissions and exit guidance will be clearly articulated for all specialist provision.
- All partners will work together and with families in each district to:
  - reduce exclusions;
  - improve attendance;
  - improve educational outcomes (attainment and progress);
Role of SEMH Steering Group

- Be the key mechanism by which partners come together to inform the recommendations of the SEMH Review work, identify key actions for next steps, and oversee the implementation of the approved actions;
- Secure engagement with all key partners;
- Be responsible for overseeing the delivery of the strategic and operational functions of the SEMH Review recommendations and associated strands of work;
- Lead on the monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations, providing a framework for reporting progress to key stakeholders and partners;
- Work in association with the Health and Wellbeing Board governance arrangements and report regularly to Schools Forum and the Children and Young People’s Committee on progress;
- Agree the communication from the group to wider stakeholders.
- Ensure the work is integrated within the following strategies and work:
  - SEND Strategy (draft)
  - early help;
  - school intervention and improvement;
  - all age skills
- Support improving outcomes for children and families
Co-production

- Doing with, not doing to
- Co-developing and using an evidence base
- Co-interrogating the evidence base
- Using this to co-construct the next steps
What is the data and information telling us?

Evidence base for change
Issues

- Identification and meeting of right need at right time and in right way
  - Differences between primary and secondary primary need recorded in census
- Different needs of children and young people whose behaviour arises from:
  - an unmet learning or disability need
  - chaotic/difficult home lives
  - attachment issues
  - trauma
  - mental health needs
- Low attendance/part time timetables for some pupils
- Fixed term exclusions
- Elective home education, but not as a choice
- Significant number of individual tuition packages and other AP
- Prevalence of this group of pupils in NEET figures
- Location and accommodation of current SEMH schools
- Some movement between SEMH schools and cross border placements in similar provision
- A number of pupils with SEMH needs in independent and non-maintained SEMH and other schools
Profile of SEND in Cambridgeshire mainstream schools (Jan 18 census data)

- Slight increase in % pupils identified at SEND support in mainstream primary schools (11.7%), which is 0.6% below the statistical neighbour (SN) and 0.7% below the national average.
- Continuing decrease in % pupils identified at SEND support in mainstream secondary schools (8.9%), which is 2.5% below the SN and 1.7% below the national average.
- Slight decrease in % pupils with EHCPs in mainstream primary schools (1.6%) but remains 0.2% above the SN and national average.
- Continuing decrease in % pupils with EHCPs in mainstream secondary schools (2.4%) which is 1% above the SN and 0.8% above the national average.
Profile in special schools in and outside of Cambridgeshire (Jan census)

- Significant increase in number but decrease in % in maintained and academy special school places in Cambridgeshire (920 in 2016 and 1012 in 2018)
- Continuing increase in number and % of Cambridgeshire pupils in special schools outside of Cambridgeshire (47 in 2016 and 70 in 2018).
- Increase in the number but slight decrease in % of Cambridgeshire pupils in independent and non-maintained special schools (INMSS) (133 in 2016 and 149 in 2018)
- Of the 149 pupils in INMSS:
  - 91 with primary need of ASC (61 aged between 9 and 16)
  - 36 with primary need of SEMH (32 aged between 9 and 16)
### Profile of SEMH Primary Need (SEND Support and EHCP) Jan census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 Primary</th>
<th>2017 Secondary</th>
<th>2017 Special</th>
<th>2018 Primary</th>
<th>2018 Secondary</th>
<th>2018 Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambs %</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat Neighbour %</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England %</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elective Home Education

- Significant increase from 610 in 14/15 to 986 in 17/18
- 89% of EHE pupils in 17/18 had previously attended school
- 21% (185) of these had an SEN need identified
  - 20% have SEMH identified as a primary or secondary need.
Alternative Provision (Oct 18)

- 444 pupils
  - half have or had involvement with Social Care
  - 284 identified behaviour as reason for AP
  - 64 have or had involvement with YOS
  - 189 pupils with EHCP
    - 92 ASC
    - 74 SEMH
Exclusions

- Low permanent exclusions.
- Continued increase in numbers of FTE
- Continued increase in days lost to FTE (5746 in 16/17)
- Differences between districts, including differences in average length of FTE
- Majority in primary schools are in years 4, 5 and 6
- Of the number of pupils in primary schools receiving at least 1 fixed term exclusion
  - Increase in pupils with no identified SEND being fixed term excluded.
  - Increase in primary aged pupils being fixed term excluded at SEND Support
  - Decrease in secondary aged pupils being fixed term excluded at SEND Support
  - Decrease in pupils with an EHCP being fixed term excluded
Actions being undertaken

- Further interrogating the data and information of different groups
- Identification of further information required
- Tracking back on high need/cost pupils’ previous profiles
- Tracking destinations/outcomes of pupils who have accessed different types of provision
- Feedback from parents/carers
- Feedback from young people
- Feedback from settings / schools / colleges / other agencies
- Using all of the above to develop options for future delivery
Considerations to inform options for next steps

- We can expect an increase in the number of children and young people requiring specialist support/provision which will have:
  - Implications for universal services
  - Implications for specialist provision
  - Implications for specialist services
  - Implications for budgets

- We need to use the resources we collectively have available to us to best effect
  - What is making the most difference to improving outcomes?
  - What will we need to stop doing in order to start doing the things the evidence indicates we need to do?
  - What do we need to do more of / less of?

- We need to be confident that fixed term exclusions and part time timetables are recorded accurately

- We need to systematically identify and share best practice so that it becomes common practice
Questions to consider and feedback through SEMH Sub Group reps

- What factors are contributing to the increases and decreases in children and young people accessing different types of provision?
- What might the reasons be for the differences between Cambridgeshire and Statistical Neighbour and England averages?
- What might the reasons be for the differences between phases?
- What challenges do you see in schools and services?
- What needs to be put in place to better support children and young people locally (in mainstream and specialist provision)?
- How are schools using the guide / toolkit for SEND?
- In your experience, how consistent is identification of need?
- What actions can be taken to support better identification of need and better support, including school to school support from schools with identified best practice?
- What further actions could be identified to support addressing these?
- Anything else you think should be considered
Heads on sub group looking at developing options for model for primary years
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