**Questions raised**

* Can we articulate scope and lot definitions?

*The scope of Phase 2 is yet to be decided. Once the scope has been defined the working group will look at what lots may be required.*

* What registration will be required to join the FPS? Some are not Section 41/Ofsted registered – will they be excluded? Could there be a specific lot for these providers?

*Phase 1 of the SEND FPS required providers to have Ofsted registration. However no decisions have yet been made on what registration, if any providers will need for phase 2 (Post 16) and this will be explored via the Local Authority working group and be picked up again at the next rounds of provider engagement.*

* Some LAs don’t use providers who are not Section 41 / Ofsted registered – how will this be addressed/communicated to providers? Should we check with LAs what their local practice is?

*Links to question above….We are not in a position to direct individual LAs but can look at what proportion of LAs have made a firm decision not to use Section 41 / Ofsted registered providers and communicate this to aid providers in deciding whether or not to apply to join the FPS.*

* Can we hold more consultation sessions so providers can continue to engage and shape?

*Yes, we will look at further sessions to ensure providers continue to be engaged in shaping the development of Phase 2. We will update you on this shortly.*

* Can Local Offers be articulated more clearly?

*If this is directed at local authorities SEND Local Offers then…..although we are not in a position to influence individual LAs we can pass on this request to them.*

*Our first round of provider engagement had a real focus on the key ingredients for success, one being a clear and effective template to capture the broad range and flexibility of each provider’s offer. This will be a key theme for our next engagement sessions.*

* Can we have more details on the process for developing Phase 2 and the timescales?

*The current target date for Phase 2 being open for providers to join the FPS is November. This is very much a target and if we feel that more time is needed for effective engagement with the sector this will be extended.*

* How does the FPS fit with existing timescales for consultation on placements?

*The FPS is a tool to provide options to local authorities to present to young people and parent carers when consulting. The timescales and approach taken by individual local authorities remains the same. We understand that sourcing a Post 16 placement for a significant number of high needs students takes place early in the calendar and before March. If at all possible timescales will aim to support local authorities in their placement sourcing from January 2022.*

* What is included in the scope of the purchasing system? What can and cannot be done?

*The FPS will not resolve some of the systemic issues in SEND Commissioning raised by providers, it is a tool to be used by authorities to find the most suitable placements for young people and to widen the options available to them. However, we have seen that through developing regional purchasing systems for social care that this has initiated and facilitated the sharing of information, gaps in service and good practice between local authorities and further cemented relationships with providers .*

* How will the wishes of Parents Carers and young people remain at the centre?

*The FPS is a tool to help authorities identify which providers may be able to offer a placement to young people. The SEN Code of Practice and parental choice remains central to this process and Direct Awards may be made via the FPS if required.*

* Can parental preference override the requirement to go to all FPS providers?

*Yes, Direct Awards can be made if required.*

* How will service information be collected – can we consult on the template?

*Yes, we will consult on the template used to collect service information. Capturing a setting’s offer effectively is essential in order for choice, flexibility and collaboration to drive the best outcomes for young people. We will collect service information at the point of tender and then providers can update this if required at regular points throughout the life of the FPS.*

* Can the FPS offer an opportunity to go out to the market at Year 9 to look at building packages earlier?

*This is something that the working group can look at both in the documentation for the FPS and guidance to LAs.*

* Can we explain how the information on services is used?

*The information on services is used by placing authorities to inform decision making on placements. It may be shared in part with young people and parent carers. Information on services is not currently shared with other providers through existing Flexible Purchasing System’s but we will consult on this as we believe collaboration is an important aspect of the FPS to generate choice and flexibility for young people.*

* Will providers have access to each other’s information? If so will this contain sensitive information?

*As above information is not shared with other providers, only placing authorities. If it is decided that sharing some information with other providers would support collaboration then it will be made clear to providers what information is and isn’t shared. No sensitive information, eg pricing will be shared.*

* How will providers know they are on the FPS? How will they know the information is correct?

*Providers will be required to go through a tender process to join the FPS. This will be carried out on a platform called ‘The Chest’ / ‘Proactis’ / ‘ProContract’. Providers will be required to upload information and due diligence will be carried out before providers are successful. There will be set timescales for this and procurement guidance to be followed. Providers who are successful will receive an award letter and a contract to sign.*

**Comments**

* Don’t want to lose anything good through the FPS being set up.
* Need to be mindful that cost processes are different between colleges and schools
* For young people that will not or cannot go out - Opportunity for future digital – i.e. remote working
* Need to have dedicated resources to engage with employers
* Vocational Profiling has provided massive improvements
* Earlier involvement in the transition process would be helpful to aid planning, particularly on physical adjustments.
* Advice and guidance for parents and students could be improved.
* Planning sometimes works better with looked after children eg housing etc is more planned and next steps
* Structure is needed for collaboration to take place and remove duplication.

|  |
| --- |
| Breakout 1 |
| **Examples of good practice in delivering excellent outcomes for young people** |
| * Supported internships can be one of the best examples where supported employment providers are involved. Does rely on communication and lead partner being identified, regular reviews and each provider knowing what outcomes they are delivering. Other services being brought in eg SALT, social care, benefits issues. * Examples of ‘off site’ collaboration with a range of providers – sometimes 2/3 providers involved with one or more children. * Close working between SEND teams and colleges is huge part of success, LA’s that have openness to engage provides more positive outcomes * Examples of timetables for CYP that change on a yearly basis to meet the needs of each child * Sometimes delivering positive outcomes is not about meeting what is written in the EHCP * Collaboration is key but needs to happen in the early stages of transition, independent living is available as well as in house apprenticeship schemes * Supported internships – very successful and partnership working. Local hospital partnership and Active Tameside (leisure and sports centres). * Therapy supported internship tried through GFE route but didn’t come off * Digital Space and workbased learning in a digital studio. Link with local employers. Slightly different model as employers are small. Provider host with links to employers. * Transition is a massive jump and hard to get right. Many providers seek to get involved at the earliest stage as this can have a massive impact later on in terms of positive outcomes if the preparations and planning is done early by the provider, LA, parents and other partners. * Provider forum / ongoing engagement when the FPS is up and running (take account of existing forums) * SENCO appointed at Liverpool City region College |
| **How does your offer flex to the needs and aspirations of young people?** |
| * Independent living offer * Supported Internships * Changing curriculum every 12 months or less in some situations depending on CYP * Each learner has their own curriculum in some settings * Partnership with Manchester Adult Education (PEP Programme). * Flex the offer and bespoke to each young person and develops as yp becomes more confident. For some initial contact into home, travel training. * Outcomes set in line with EHCP. * One college offers a bridge to a further education course for individuals with complex needs to sample vocational courses for 12 months, after this they are able to move into mainstream provision. * Flexibility already offered at some colleges ie 2 / 3 day week * Collaboration happening ie joint placements |
| Outside of formal reviews how do you listen and act upon the voice of the young person? |
| * Most providers doing this constantly informally with young people. * Sometimes a conflict between a procurement system and a person centred approach. Need to consider how call off works from a young person’s point of view. Need to build relationships between the provider and the young person. * Voice of YP could be clearer in referrals - providers receiving referrals that are inappropriate in terms of the young person’s wishes (creative provider) – not just matching on needs but also covering aspirations. * Pupil questionnaires * Transition workers who are main point of contact for each YP * Ad-hoc meetings that can be reactive to certain situations * Changes to yearly curriculum depending on circumstances – COVID has been a great learning curve that shows how things can be delivered * Listening to the young person and being reactive, particularly when things are going wrong. * Tutorial system and student council. Always get a response either if can or cannot do. * Pupil questionnaire and annual changes. * Support with transition via a named person. Formal and informal opportunities which feed into college systems. * SEND Ignition (person centred planning for early and effective preparing for adulthood) – direct work with young people, parent / carers, settings and all partners that can support a young person achieve their goals. * Quality of EHCP is key * Ed Psych input outdated sometimes….more resource needed (however shortage)! * Early planning and settings involvement in annual reviews….enough time to build a picture of young person and arrive at plan A or plan B depending on course availability and / or grades achieved by yp / independence skills |
| **Examples of innovative practice in terms of reasonable adjustments** |
| * Packages are developed for each child specific to their needs and requirements i.e. physical or mental * ‘Offsite’ training or workplace arrangements to allow a break from class based learning * Home based learning through technology has been a positive from COVID * Land based provider – change layout to milking parlour. * Early transition Sensory Teams carry out workplace assessment ie. Visual impairment. Essential for health and safety. Accommodate physical requirements. * Individual packages based on individual skills sets – personalised to the individual * One of the learners came from another borough and wanted to train to be a teaching assistant. The provider worked with a local school in the area to provide this opportunity. In order to access this opportunity the provider set up a course in childcare to enable the individual to have the qualification required to work in this setting. |
| How do you access or partner with work-based provision? |
| * Regular consultation/engagement with local employees * Offer certain types of work based provision as part of curriculum i.e. common themes like beauty, mechanics * Life skills in money management, shopping etc. * Provider have dedicated employer engagement officers who build relationship with local employers and are constantly searching for opportunities. * Live briefs and visits from employer/employees. * Constant engagement with employers * Some providers also offer other types of training to support work based provision such as Travel Training and helping with independent living skills (money management). This is hard to do for the larger colleges. |
| Do you have a Supported Internship programme? |
| * Varied picture with some providing a Supported Internship programme but mostly work experience being provided |
| How do you currently collaborate across the Post 16 sector for those with an EHCP? |
| * Provider and employer links. * Attend Post16 Groups (termly) * Contact with Employment officers * PfA and Sensory Support Links * Attend Parent Partnership Forums |
| What are the barriers to further collaboration? |
| * Sometimes working with one provider meets a YP need and this shouldn’t be dismissed if it is the right option * Potential for communication not to work if there is collaboration. * Has to be individualised and there won’t be one option for everyone. * Not good at working with other education providers. * Need to clearly define providers offers rather than creating a mishmash of offers. How do we use the system to clearly communicate the offers from different providers. Use of the provider spreadsheet. Need to make it clear what providers don’t do as well as what they do. * ESFA funding systems makes collaboration between education providers difficult. * Would be useful for providers to understand what each other’s offers are to support collaboration or re-referral. * Funding from the LA’s * Sometimes the offer can become too much for the YP * Employees are able to support some YP but are able to pick and choose * Review processes/decision making within LA’s delay transitions * Funding for Non-Section 41 Provision * Lack of opportunities in certain areas – employment opportunities number different * Not enough capacity in the system and employment options. * Poor attendance at school need to be developed. * Employers are able to cherry pick young people. * Unrealistic expectations by employers * Lack of Travel Training * People who need social care support go into independent living settings and the education element tends to drop off. Colleges see little collaboration with social workers and health in terms of the review process |
| Breakout 2 |
|  |
| Feedback on the scope of Phase 2. Can all types of settings come together in one Post 16 scope? |
| * Provide digital work experiences and are on a couple of frameworks. Some frameworks are more proactive in terms of securing new provision. Have been on one framework locally for three years and not had any referrals and would encourage looking at new providers. Have worked with those authorities who are not referring through the framework as they work with them in other ways. * Process is invisible for providers and can remove personal conversations. * Need to build in consultation process and dialogue. * As a mainstream provider would find it useful to be able to refer to other agencies for specialist support. * Some LAs have a meeting to bring people together re vulnerable groups of children (focus on NEET)….can this be applied to Post 16 FPS approach * Providers should be able to flag up their USPs to allow collaboration. * Ability to allow providers to come together where needed. * Choice is all important * Is this going to include alternative education offers? For children that can’t get into school for whatever reason. Provided in partnership. * How would a provider be selected from the FPS? * Confirmation of the referral process would be beneficial * How will all providers be brought together in one place, this could possibly confuse things even further * Interested to know the practicalities of using the FPS? * Needs to be more of a detailed workshop on how things will actually work on a day to day basis. * Confused about how things will actually work. * Struggling to see how it will work * Thought session would give a lot more detail about things will work * Systems are already complex and so we need to really understand * Check re document that Clare referred to re Natspec work to capture offer * Providers offer needs to be continually updated, timing of updates important to support referral / choice etc * Some courses might be offered but not viable (ie due to numbers) therefore taken down and new courses offered etc * Be wary of the offer from larger organisations that have a setting as head office and other satellite provision |
| What would help providers influence the scope of Phase 2 meaningfully? |
| * Need to have more market engagement sessions to understand what we are trying to achieve * SEND Code of Practice currently being reviewed so it may be best to see the outcome before moving forward * Need more information * Would it be based on cost only – this is a big concern. * Concern about Commercial in confidence information being shared. * Need to learn for the HE model (Student Finance England) and what did not work. It could make provision not financially viable. Students did not have choice as it was based on costs only and not learner choice. It is banded or individual costings. * Concerned about timescales and that there is only one more meeting between now and November is a concern. Feels like it is moving a pace and still confused and lack of understanding about what it looks like. Feel that there is a lot of work to be done in a short space of time |
| What would providers want to see in the specification? |
| * Clear processes i.e. Referrals, T&C’s, Contracts * Need to factor in that outcomes and aspirations might change for a YP over time. * Pen pictures as referrals including outcomes and aspirations would be helpful. * Learn from good case studies * Independence skills how do we capture in spec and collaboration |
|  |
| For those involved in Phase 1 is there anything you feel won’t translate well to Phase 2? |
| * Phase 1 seems to be functioning reasonably smoothly. Some of the referral mechanisms might need to change for Phase 2. * 1 page profile could be very different in Post 16 placements as this may not provide enough information for providers to say no * Costs can be very different in Post 16 depending on collaboration etc * Really important to get the format for capturing a settings offer right / flexible enough……phase 1 was a bit difficult to explain fully and free text boxes wouldn’t expand etc * Be useful for providers to submit their prospectus (with photos, videos) * Lessons should be learnt from other regional FPS…..ie balance of disability ie VI * Secondary needs need to be captured |
| What are the barriers you see to us achieving the outcomes we’re looking for? |
| * Providers were not sure what we were trying to achieve in developing an FPS? * Post 16 is very different to Pre 16 and needs can be met differently i.e. Supported Internships, Apprenticeships etc. so the offer is always changing depending on referrals, CYP * Application processes for GFE are different and also significant variety of courses and limits on numbers onto courses etc * How does the FPS link to existing systems for student referrals * Can parent carers or young people see the variety of provider out there and have access to the offers? YP might not know what is available. * Where all needs cannot be met providers would not take the referral. Referral is sometimes first time they have heard of young person. Young person should be at the heart. Would support dialogue and conversation about young people. Difficult for general providers to cover scope of what they do and don’t offer. * Search is often defined by SEND need and not aspirations and interests. * Providers work very closely with their home authority but non home authorities the relationship can be more difficult and more inappropriate referrals are made. Referrals are coming through from different parts of the same authority. |