

## SEMH Working Group

### Wednesday 18 October Key discussion points and notes of action

**Our shared ambition:** By September 2018 there will be sufficient provision in Hartlepool for primary and secondary aged pupils to support their social, emotional and mental health needs.

#### **Discussion:**

It was felt that there may be some perceived value in this group being chaired by a headteacher, with local authority convenor capacity. It was agreed to decide this at the next meeting.

Agenda item

MPA briefly summarised the work of the previous SEMH group during 2016-17 and the model that was proposed, but didn't quite come to fruition. MPA circulated documents previously shared with 2016-17 SEMH group: the 'bubble diagram' of provision and governance, and the expressions of interest summary as at June 2016. It was agreed that there has been significant change in schools since June 2016 and that the expressions of interest information held little current value other than indicating that there were schools willing to consider being providers, and other willing to fund places with providers. There was some concern expressed in the meeting about models that meant that some schools could 'buy' places whilst others could not, for whatever reason.

It was agreed that we need to be clear about the scale and scope of the problem we are trying to address. Outcomes from the ARP review questionnaire will help with this picture, as does the survey carried out by schools last year (led by Lynn P and Julie T). It was felt that finalising the SEMH banding descriptors and then asking all schools to use these to generate a fully accurate picture early in the New Year of 2018 would put us in a better place to understand this scale and scope.

Some discussion took place around Stockton's model of '**enhanced schools**'. **It was agreed** to invite someone from Stockton to our next meeting to briefly describe:

- ✓ Outline of their provision and processes
- ✓ What the positives are
- ✓ What the barriers to are or were
- ✓ How they are funded

Caroline Reed

Some discussion took place around Durham's provision and processes. Durham's paperwork was circulated to aid the discussion. **It was agreed** to invite someone from Durham to our

next meeting to briefly describe their provision and processes on the same basis as Stockton (above).

Julie Thomas

**Actions for next time:**

1. Think about who should chair this group
2. Look at SEMH section of SEN banding structures to finalise it – CRE, LYA, DTU + LAL + SMI + EP rep
3. Ask reps from Stockton and Durham to present (10 mins max each) at next meeting:
  - a. Follow up Stockton rep – CRE
  - b. Follow up Durham rep – JTH

**Date of next meeting**

[Schools capital sub-group 9 Nov, 11.00am]

**SEMH Working Group, 15 Nov, 9.30am**