

### Case Study Prompts: Review Following Alternative Provision (AP) Placement

These prompts are designed to comprehensively reviewing a Sam 's journey following their placement, focusing on the effectiveness of the intervention and necessary system adjustments.

*(Pupils identify and details have been removed from this Case Study)*

#### 1. Sam Background and Placement Context (The 'Before')

This section establishes the historical context of the Sam before and during the AP placement.

- **1.1. Pre-Placement Rationale:** What was the specific, primary reason for referral to AP, and what immediate crisis or cumulative factors led to this decision?

Sam was permanently excluded from his mainstream setting in December 2024 citing physical assault against adults, verbal abuse, absconding and threatening behaviour against adults.

- **1.2. Referral Source & Process:** Who initiated the referral (e.g., school leadership, LA, specific service), and what were the agreed-upon objectives for the AP placement?

The referral was initiated by the statutory day-6 process following the PEX.

- **1.3. Educational History:** How long had the Sam been attending their main/referring school, and what type of school was it (e.g., mainstream secondary, special school, academy)?

Sam began at his mainstream setting in Early Years and was PEX'd after one term in Year 2. Sam received 1 fixed term exclusion prior to PEX, but mother was asked many times to pick him up from school due to his presenting behaviours. Sam was placed on a PTT during Year 2.

- **1.4. Contextual History:** Briefly outline the Sam 's family background, contextual history, or significant life events relevant to their educational engagement.

Sam and his sibling were CP at the time of referral to Jigsaw. This was due to historical and current concerns over neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse and the ability of parent to provide a safe environment for the children. Sam was moved to PLO status during his placement. He has not had contact with his father since birth and does not have stable protective factors around his home life. At time of admission, mother was very reluctant to engage in any kind of support and actively blocked access to the children by social services. He is in receipt of FSM. His mainstream setting declined a parent request for an EHCPNA. School suggested that mother was not forthcoming in supporting them with filling in forms and she did not accept home tuition while he was on a PTT.

- **1.5. Previous Support & Needs:** Summarise any previous involvement from external services (e.g., CAMHS, Social Services, YOT, specialist tutoring) prior to the AP placement. Were any identified medical needs or Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) established upon arrival at the AP?

Sam and his family have received support through social and family workers as well as pastoral support in his mainstream setting. He was also referred to SALT and completed a course of this prior to his placement at Jigsaw. He was referred for an ASD assessment at 3 years old and was initially accepted by CAHMS who then withdrew support citing changes in parent attitude to social care needed to be evident

	<p>before any work could be offered to Sam. SENDIASS were involved for support and school described their support as providing a 1:1 adult, following a trauma-informed plan, low demand and allocating a safe space for him.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2. Professional Intervention and Service Delivery (The 'During')</b></p>	
<p>This section details the nature of professional support and collaboration during the placement.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.1. Core Professional Team:</b> Identify all key professionals, services, and multi-agency partners involved during the placement (e.g., AP staff, APST task force members, Educational Psychologist, YOT, family support workers).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Jigsaw Team</b>  <b>Social Care</b>  <b>Other</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.2. Nature of Involvement:</b> For each core professional/service, describe the specific intervention they provided (e.g., mentoring, therapeutic support, family mediation, specialist teaching) and the frequency/intensity of that support.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Jigsaw Team -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sam attended his statutory provision at Jigsaw from January 2025 – July 2025. He was closed to outreach support in October 2025 due to EHCP.</li> <li>• The Jigsaw Service provided a nurture setting and program of support, utilising a range of assessment tools (including observations, SEMH screeners, and interventions), working towards SAM 's identified objectives and outcomes which were set on admission and reviewed on a half-termly basis, or sooner if required. This support extended to family support and building a trusted relationship with mother. The Jigsaw team facilitated contact between Sam, mother and social care and attended all CP and PLO meetings.</li> <li>• The Jigsaw Service kept records of any assessments, observations, screeners, and activities completed, and this information was shared with SAM 's school post-placement. The Jigsaw Service successfully put in an EHCPNA which finalised prior to integrating back into mainstream.</li> <li>• The Jigsaw Service took every opportunity to make links to English and Maths activities and to re-engage Sam through a bespoke academic curriculum, wherever possible.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Jigsaw Service provided and offered whole-school training, coaching and mentoring support to SAM 's transition school post-placement, accompanied him on all initial transition visits and allocated him an outreach support worker.</li> <li>• Sam began weekly counselling sessions in June 2025 through Jigsaw; this continues in his mainstream setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social Care</b> – CP procedures and visits completed. Social and family worker. PLO status assigned. Back to CP.</p> <p><b>Other</b> – NHS team – health checks, FAP – allocating school, Transition school staff actively involved in transition and integration, EP report completed as part of EHCPNA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.3. Collaboration Model:</b> How effective was the communication and joint working between the AP, the referring school, and other external services? Provide examples of successful collaborative activities (e.g., joint review meetings, transition planning).</li> </ul>	<p>PEX school's only collaboration was to provide day-6 paperwork and send on CPOMS behaviour and safeguarding logs.</p> <p>Collaboration with Social Care was effective as we were able to build a bridge between social and family workers and mother. We created an environment that was open, honest and transparent with mother and maintained close links Social Care, sharing any safeguarding concerns promptly and directly with them. This relationship was essential in creating the right environment for Sam to feel safe disclosing concerns and the social care status to be moved to PLO. Jigsaw attended all TAC/TAF/CP and PLO meetings.</p> <p>Collaboration with transition school to ensure smooth transition.</p>
<b>3. Assessments, Screeners, and Data (The 'Evidence')</b>	
This section relies on objective data to measure progress and inform future planning.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3.1. Completed Data Collection:</b> List all formal and informal assessments, screeners, or diagnostic tools completed during the placement (e.g., Boxall Profile, cognitive assessments, reading/literacy screeners, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boxall Profile</li> <li>• Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</li> <li>• Readiness to reintegrate tool</li> <li>• Dyslexia Function Tool</li> <li>• Emotional Literacy</li> <li>• CATS</li> <li>• Executive Functioning</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensory Processing Screener</li> <li>• Well-being questionnaire</li> <li>• Intervention feedback (All About Me, Volcano of Emotions, Starving the Anxiety Gremlin, Hamish and Milo, Transition)</li> <li>• Sam voice</li> <li>• Daily de-briefs</li> <li>• Session and activity feedback</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3.2. Key Findings and Interpretation:</b> Summarise the main findings and conclusions drawn from these assessments. What new insights were gained regarding the Sam 's academic, behavioural, social, or emotional profile?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Boxall</b> – Both diagnostic (52) and developmental (49) scores show very high levels of difficulties.</p> <p><b>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</b> – Overall stress level 23 (19 to 40 is very high) with high levels of difficulty identified in getting along with peers and behaviour difficulties.</p> <p><b>Readiness to reintegrate Tool</b> – Sam scored higher in the exit assessment compared to the entry assessment indicating he progressed in the skills needed to cope in mainstream school during his placement at Jigsaw.</p> <p><b>Emotional Literacy</b> – Sam scored well in motivation and empathy but demonstrated a lower score in self-awareness</p> <p><b>Sensory sensitivity screener</b> – Sam has significant sensory needs and is constantly seeking out sensory feedback.</p> <p><b>CATS</b> – Sam was placed at the lower end of general ability and demonstrated a moderate spatial bias.</p> <p><b>Sam’s Voice</b> – Sam had a very negative self-view and a poor perception of himself as a learner. He voiced mistrust in adults and felt that his voice was not heard. He showed strong attachments to some staff and experienced highly emotional reactions to perceived injustice.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3.3. Documentation and Reports:</b> Note the location/links to all relevant formal reports (e.g., Educational Psychology reports, AP exit reports) that contain the assessment data.</li> </ul>	<p>All reports and assessments are in his Jigsaw In-reach file.</p>
<b>4. Outcomes, Lesson Learnings, and Future Process (The 'Reflection')</b>	
<p>This section evaluates the overall success of the placement and drives institutional improvement.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4.1. Successes Achieved:</b> Identify and describe the main successes of the AP placement, linking them back to the original</li> </ul>	<p>Sam built trusting relationships with all staff and was able to recognise and verbalise emotions more effectively and before they led to</p>

<p>referral objectives. This should cover academic, behavioural, environmental and/or social-emotional progress.</p>	<p>dysregulated behaviour. He developed his social skills and was able to interact reciprocally with peers of his choice. He transitioned successfully into his mainstream school and is accessing a whole-class environment for the first time since early years. He engaged more with academic demand, responding particularly well to disguised learning and learning outside of a desk and chair environment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4.2. Persistent Barriers:</b> What significant challenges or barriers (e.g., capacity issues, non-engagement, systemic issues, external factors) hindered the Sam 's progress or complicated the intervention?</li> </ul>	<p>Sam struggled to build up to a full-time placement following his PTT in mainstream. Mother was reluctant to engage initially with any professionals. FAP process was problematic in finding the right mainstream setting for him (pushback from schools approached). Sam was very reluctant to discuss feelings or experiences at the start of his placement – parental influence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4.3. Recommended Process Amendments:</b> Based on the experience, what specific changes or amendments are needed for the AP referral process, funding allocation, support mechanisms, or transition planning to improve future outcomes?</li> </ul>	<p>Earlier intervention and referral from the Jigsaw Outreach Team to mitigate PEX. Quicker submission of EHCPNA pre-PEX, not leaving it until he began Jigsaw.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4.4. Actions Completed:</b> What immediate actions were taken by the school/AP/services following the review?</li> </ul>	<p>Outreach colleagues and other services reminded that Jigsaw is an early intervention service, and referrals should not wait until crisis point.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>4.5. Actions to Be Completed:</b> What specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) actions still need to be executed to consolidate the Sam 's progress or adjust institutional processes?</li> </ul>	<p>Final visits from outreach support to conclude the transition and integration process for Sam back into mainstream.</p>
<p><b>5. Stakeholder Feedback (The 'Perspective')</b></p>	
<p>This section captures the qualitative experience of all involved parties.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1. Sam Feedback:</b> How did the Sam describe their experience at the AP? What did they feel was most helpful, and what did they find most challenging? (Include direct quotes where appropriate and anonymised).</li> </ul>	<p>Sam voiced he was very excited about starting his new school. He has spoken to staff at Jigsaw about making friends and the time he has spent on Forest School activities. He has voiced loving Jigsaw and his teachers here but has not voiced anything about leaving. Sam spoke about enjoying sensory activities and verbalised affection towards staff.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.2. Parent/Carer Feedback:</b> What was the family's perception of the AP placement, the support received, and the subsequent outcomes? What feedback did they provide on communication and partnership working?</li> </ul>	<p>Initially, mother was very guarded and sceptical of our involvement. Trusting and supportive relationship was built which culminated in parent expressing to Jigsaw that she does not know what she would have done without our support and thanked us for the fabulous job that we did for Sam. She purchased gifts and cards to express her thanks.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.3. Referring School Feedback:</b> How does the referring school evaluate the Sam 's readiness for reintegration (if applicable) and the overall efficacy of the AP support in meeting their identified needs?</li> </ul>	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.4. Transition School Feedback:</b> How does the referring school evaluate the Sam 's readiness for reintegration (if applicable) and the overall efficacy of the AP support in meeting their identified needs?</li> </ul>	Transition school was supportive from the beginning, but did voice concerns over his settling in. They were very complimentary of the support from Jigsaw staff and the ongoing advice and information shared before he joined.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.5. AP Staff Feedback:</b> What overall reflection does the AP staff have on the intervention, the Sam 's engagement, and the handover/transition process?</li> </ul>	All staff voiced that Sam progressed in all areas while at Jigsaw. Recognising emotions, allowing adults to intervene on his behalf rather than reacting physically and engaging in learning were key points mentioned.