

Question 15: To what extent do you agree or disagree that introducing a bespoke alternative provision performance framework, based on these 5 outcomes, will improve the quality of alternative provision?

CONTENTS

SNJ's response to Question 15	1
Responses from parents/SNJ readers	3
	3
	4
	5
	5
	5
	5

SNJ's response to Question 15

1. The question really is WHY are most children who arrive in AP “at a late stage in their education, having already fallen a long way behind their peers”? You are seeking to shut the door after the horse has bolted - you need to do far more work further up the process to prevent this and the Green paper simply doesn't succeed here.
2. If, having answered and acted on the above, you still have children who have been dumped out of school, then it is, indeed, not right to expect them to meet the same expectations of other children.
3. Who would be on your "expert working group"? Would you include experts from AP schools? Young people who have attended AP? Parents of young people who have attended AP? It's not good enough to simply appoint a senior PCF member to it. It's not good enough to cherry-pick people who will give you the answers you want.

4. On your five key outcomes, you need to ask why you think these are the right “outcomes”?
 - 4.1. **effective outreach support**, Is this even an outcome? It seems far more like an input. It certainly isn't a child-based outcome. An effective outcome might be a young person who can regulate their emotions effectively, and who can understand why their responses have been as they have (abuse, childhood neglect, a neurodivergence, a disability/difference) and how to begin to manage them or to recover).
 - 4.2. **improved attendance** When a child understands what they are doing there and feels safe, understood, valued and wanted, then attendance will improve. Attendance in itself is not an outcome. Attendance targets are also discriminatory for many disabled students, who are unable to attend school for medical reasons.
 - 4.3. **reintegration**, Reintegration where? Back to the same school that traumatised them? Surely the LA should be conducting an EHC Needs Assessment to understand the kind of provision and therapy they need. Why is a happy person not considered a good outcome?
 - 4.4. **academic attainment, with a focus on English and maths**, English and Maths, while important, may not be where a vulnerable child's talents lie. Surely as well as academic subjects, children who have been failed (note, not failed themselves) should be encouraged to find what motivates them, where their talents lie to help their own self-esteem. This also again discriminates against students with certain disabilities which makes progress in these subjects difficult.
 - 4.5. **successful post-16 transitions**. This should also include whether the transition is still a success after one or two years, not just that the transition itself completes.
 5. Children in AP deserve the same access to high-quality academic teaching and additionally high levels of emotional and social support but nothing in the Green Paper suggests that this will be the case.
 6. There is also no mention of non-secondary AP. What happens to younger or 16+ young people?
-

Responses from parents/SNJ readers

NB: These views are those of parents for whom we have acted as a conduit for their response to the Green Paper. The views expressed from here are not necessarily those held by Special Needs Jungle.



1. Why is improved attendance an outcome but NOT child mental health and self-esteem?
2. Why is improved attendance an outcome but NO mention is given to successfully identifying the needs of the child and helping them to understand themselves and where their difficulties lie.
3. Without those, attendance is simply being forced and is without value and will often reinforce negative behaviour patterns stemming from still being misunderstood.
4. If lower performance is expected in AP, how will children reintegrate into mainstream at an age-appropriate level? Reintegration with much younger peers will further damage self-esteem/mental health, likewise, reintegration with the same age but academically more capable will also be damaging. It could undo any progress made. Would it not be better to keep these children in a safe environment working towards their own goals and needs, rather than holding them up continually against this narrow view of what a child should be at any given point?
5. Who should be on an “expert working group? Where possible someone who cares about the child and is personally invested in them SHOULD be part of this expert working group.
6. Who would develop this performance framework? There is no detail here.
7. Does Ofsted have enough powers to inspect academy chains? Is OFSTED the right group to be inspecting these chains? What is their understanding of the needs of these specific children.
8. These outcomes are not child-focused, instead yet again focussing on the narrow outlook of what children should look like at any given stage in their life, but takes no account of life circumstances, diagnosis or health that may inhibit that. They set children up for failure. Any

amendments to policies pertaining to children should have the children at the very heart. These do not.



1. I disagree because the outcomes you are suggesting are not the outcomes I would prioritise.
2. I think Outreach support is a good idea – perhaps tutors at home or in an appropriate place
3. I don't think attendance is a priority – especially not for children who are highly anxious and who need to take days out from the overwhelming experience.
4. Reintegration is only realistic if the place the child is being “reintegrated” to meet their needs and the child is at the performance level of their age group – how realistic is this? I would say not realistic.
5. Also, who cares about reintegrating? The reason the mainstream placement has broken down is because needs are not being met – so I suggest you change the mainstream placement rather than try to change the child. If you can find a better place for that child – a better environment where the child can thrive (ie a good AP or specialist school) then stick with that.
6. Yes all children should reach their academic attainment but that is about providing the right environment and the right teaching.
7. Yes, successful post-16 transitions are important.
8. I am wary of your suggestion of an “expert working group” as it's not clear who this would include.
9. I don't think your suggestions are child-focussed. They seem to be trying to fit a child into the existing system which has already not worked or they wouldn't be in an AP.
10. I suggest you provide much better alternatives to the current mainstream system which is failing so many children. So good APs, special schools, therapy schools etc. All these different types of education are needed as a permanent solution. So the aim should not be about getting back to mainstream – mainstream simply doesn't work for so many children.



1. I strongly disagree that this framework will improve the quality of alternative provision, and I strongly disagree with the underlying premise of the question. SEND children need to be properly supported in school, not sidelined into AP.
2. These outcomes are aimed at difficult pupils, not SEND pupils. If SEND pupils are struggling with attendance and integration, this is often because they are not being supported properly in mainstream school and are finding it too stressful. Putting them in AP will not improve this - the same problems will be waiting for them when they return to school.
3. English and Maths are fundamental, but a proper education involves far more than this.



1. I completely disagree. The outcomes are not sensible and show a lack of understanding of the spectrum of SEND children. One size does not fit all. Alternative Provision in the way proposed is a bad idea



1. Where do life skills come into this framework? How will reintegration occur if there is a different framework? I also wonder who will help to develop the AP framework and will it be a collaboration and include social services and health outcomes too.



1. I would only slightly agree with this statement. A performance framework with measurable outcomes would obviously be welcome, but I would question whether the 5 outcomes identified are broad enough to capture all the opportunities a good education should provide. I would also ask what safeguards would be in place to stop it being a tick-box exercise that might incentivise perverse actions to meet those targets in only a very shallow way?