

Standards and Curriculum Committee

Meeting minutes

8th July 2025

5pm

Please note: This meeting will be held via TEAMS

Please note that the meeting will be recorded and transcribed for minuting purposes only

Attended: Christine Cottle (Chair of the Committee)
Cheryl Mathieson (CM)
Kate Evans (KE)
Max Thomas (MT)
Joanna Hooper (JH) – Mid Devon LB Representative
Oliver Heathman (OH) - Moorland Hub LB Representative
Corinna Tigg (CT) – East Devon Hub LB Representative

Lizzie Lethbridge (LL) – Director of Education - For item 9.
Charlotte Roe (GP) - Governance Professional
Peter Halford (DoSI/Attendance officer) - For item 8.1
Fran McLoughlin (DoI) - For item 8.2
Andy Keay (DoSI) - For item 10.

Minutes: Nicol Bush- Clerk to the Trust

No	Item	ACTION
1.	Welcome and apologies The Chair opened the meeting with a warm welcome to Trustees and Directors. Apologies received and approved from ND	
2.	Declarations of interest There were no new declarations of interest brought to the meeting.	
3.	Any other business There was no other business brought forward to the meeting.	
4.	Approval of last meeting minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The part I minutes of the meeting held on 13th May 2025 were approved as a true record and were signed accordingly. The part II minutes were circulated privately via email to those who were in attendance and were approved as a true record. ACTION- Clerk to send the approved minutes to HR, who will arrange for them to be published on the Trust website.	CLERK
5.	Matters arising from minutes of 13th May 2025 (not on the agenda) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision to be made on the development crib sheet for PP- The Chair referred to a previous discussion in an S&C meeting, where it was noted that some AH lacked a shared understanding, leading to confusion when parents questioned how funding was being used. The Chair recalled a suggestion for a pupil premium crib sheet to help standardise responses. The DoI mentioned she had started work on the paper and would revisit if needed. CM added that while the original request may have come from governors, staff also found it difficult to explain how pupil premium funding was allocated and used. She added that clearer guidance would help staff respond to parental queries more confidently. CM 	

	<p>proposed that the incoming CEO review the Trust's approach once she begins her role, as it may benefit from greater clarity. CM referenced a previous White Paper prepared by ND, which had explained the process, but noted that questions still remained. She added that the incoming CEO's review could lead to a clearer and more consistent way of communicating the allocation process. The meeting agreed with this suggestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoE to update Trustees on the meeting to establish a baseline in using the 2024 data took place- The DoE updated the meeting on the baseline and said, although the Trust had maintained a benchmark of overall data over time, it had not previously had a system in place to analyse data specifically relating to disadvantaged pupils, including those with SEND. The current system now enabled this level of analysis, and this year's data would serve as the first meaningful benchmark for evaluating outcomes for these groups moving forward. • Update on progress of the Risk register working group.- 	
6.	<p>Trust Risk Register - Evaluation of risk related to quality of provision and standards and curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training around the trust risk register • Risks related to S&C committee <p>The GP explained that the issues around the Risk Register were relevant to all committees and recommended that it be forwarded for discussion and review at the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting. Trustees agreed that it would then be brought back to the next Standards and Curriculum (S&C) meeting for further consideration.</p>	
7.	<p>Strategic Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of 2024/2025 plan • Meeting to discuss the previous year's plan and consider the proposed 25/26 plan <p>The Trustees discussed and agreed that the strategic plan had lost momentum. CM highlighted that KE had outlined objectives for the following year, but it was suggested that these be paused until there had been a wider discussion. CM added that the S&C area added value and had impact, but there was uncertainty about the effectiveness of all the other areas. It was proposed that a review be undertaken with RS (The incoming CEO) to determine whether the current strategic direction remained appropriate before progressing with future objectives.</p> <p>RS said that a clear plan was in place and reassured the meeting that the first month would be focused on reviewing existing practices. She noted that she had met with CM and the GP to discuss conducting a Trust-wide evaluation, which would be carried out collaboratively with the Board and Executive Team. The outcomes of this evaluation would inform the development of the strategic plan and help shape the updated Risk Register, providing a clearer understanding of organisational risks. RS noted that a documented review of the current year's priorities, along with impact measures, would be valuable in supporting the initial review phase. She also confirmed that meetings with all headteachers were scheduled for September as part of a collective Executive Team approach.</p> <p><u>ACTION-</u> GP, CC, KE and CM to meet with the incoming CEO (RS) and discuss the current year strategic plan priorities.</p>	GP/CC/KE/ CM/RS
8.	<p>Focus: Behaviour and Attendance</p> <p>8.1 Attendance (Report circulated before the meeting)</p> <p>The DoSI (PH) gave a brief summary of his report and offered a q&a session to the meeting. The following points and questions were raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PH confirmed the appointment of Sarah Altrim as Trust Attendance Officer. She had supported the revision of the attendance policy, including improvements to the escalation 	

	<p>procedure, which would be implemented from September. Sarah would also provide support to school administrators, ensuring attendance processes were consistent and robust, with trawls conducted every three weeks.</p> <p><i>The Chair noted that the Link Academy's performance was broadly in line with national figures. While there were slight variances, such as a small gap of around 1% in Pupil Premium data, overall alignment was considered reasonable.</i> PH raised that attendance across the Trust was generally positive, with good support received from the Attendance Improvement Officers (AIOs) throughout the year. He added that the Trust planned to continue purchasing this support next year, despite some changes to the roles. A new attendance initiative had also been introduced.</p> <p><i>A Governor asked if the persistent absence data included children who were late, or was it limited to full session absences.</i></p> <p>PH responded that it did incorporate children who were late—particularly those arriving after the register had closed, which counted as an unauthorised absence. However, with the introduction of the new Power BI system, the aim was to break down attendance data more forensically. This would allow to better distinguish between types of absence and gain clearer insights moving forward.</p> <p>The Trustees raised that greater responsibility for attendance and punctuality should be placed on parents rather than pupils. It was noted that children, particularly in primary school, should not be expected to sign themselves in when late, as lateness and absence were most often the result of parental actions.</p> <p><i>The Trustees raised a question about whether the newly appointed Trust Attendance Lead held a sufficiently strategic role. While it was acknowledged the value of their operational work, such as data analysis and policy implementation, it was questioned whether the position had the strategic oversight needed to drive long-term improvement.</i></p> <p>PH responded that he took the strategic lead at Trust level and agreed to add that into the policy.</p> <p>CM suggested that, alongside attendance figures, it would be helpful to include some form of analysis. She highlighted that as the new system was being established, having insights, particularly around persistent absence and Pupil Premium data, would provide greater context and understanding beyond the raw numbers. She added that it would be helpful to include a brief narrative alongside attendance data, particularly where figures were above the national average. She suggested that a short explanation of why rates were higher, where this was occurring, and what actions were being taken to address it would provide governors with more meaningful context, even if not in great detail.</p> <p>A LAC governor raised that attendance varied considerably between schools, often depending on the specific context of each institution or even individual cases within a single school. They also highlighted unauthorised absences as a particular concern within their LAC. <i>The Governor asked if it was common across the various schools, or was it particular hotspots where there were issues with unauthorised attendance?</i></p> <p>PH explained that there were particular hotspot schools they were working with. He mentioned that, as previously stated, the Trust had invested in the AIO service, which provided valuable support. This service ensured that policies were being followed correctly and assisted with follow-up actions, including the issuing of fines where necessary.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the DoSI- PH for his contribution to the meeting.</p> <p>8.2 Behaviour (Report circulated before the meeting)</p>	<p>DoSI-PH</p> <p>DoSI-PH</p>
--	--	-------------------------------

	<p>The DoI gave a brief verbal overview of her report and offered a Q&A session to the meeting, the Trustees had a robust in-depth discussion around the report and the following questions were raised:</p> <p><i>The Trustees noted that staff continued to report that pupil behaviour was affecting their wellbeing. They suggested that this might be something to consider further and wondered whether there could be a link between staff wellbeing, including that of non-teaching staff and the rise in exclusions.</i></p> <p>The DoI emphasised that none of the Academy Heads made exclusion decisions lightly. She explained that such decisions always required the support of a member of the EIT- preferably the CEO, DCEO, or DoE and were never made as a knee-jerk reaction. Exclusions had to be based on clear evidence, either of repeated incidents or a single serious event. She added that while exclusions were not typically a direct response to staff wellbeing concerns, Academy Heads did have a responsibility for the wellbeing of their staff. In cases where repeated incidents were causing difficulties for staff, this could be a contributing factor, though not the sole reason for exclusion.</p> <p>The DoI highlighted that a key issue was regarding the lack of support from the local authority. She explained that, as previously discussed, the limited resources available within Devon had made it increasingly difficult to access the kind of support that might have been available in the past. For instance, early help referrals, such as a REFAS (Request for Additional Support) were often declined, and no additional funding or support was provided. She noted that many Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) were submitted with requests for extra funding, particularly when a child required one-to-one support from a teaching assistant, but the funding received was insufficient to meet those needs.</p> <p><i>A LAC Governor asked if the reduced timetable pupil data fed into the overall attendance data.</i> The DoI said that data was included in the overall data.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked if the Trust could explore whether challenging behaviour was harder to shift in cases where some staff may be stuck in their ways or hold more traditional views on behaviour management. The Trustees asked if any Academy Heads included support plans for staff who may be holding on to more traditional views on behaviour, and what accountability measures are in place for those who are not adapting to the current expectations within the Link Academy Trust.</i></p> <p>The DoI responded that she assumed behaviour-related matters would be addressed through teacher appraisal, although she did not have access to those documents herself. She suggested that the DoE might have more insight into that area. The DoI noted that she regularly reminded Academy Heads of their responsibility to provide ongoing training for staff, emphasising that it should not be treated as a one-off event.</p> <p>The DoI referred to the use of audits, such as those linked to the Ordinarily Available Inclusive Provision (OAIP), which had been discussed previously. These audits offered useful tools for evaluating leadership and whole school approaches, including behaviour. She highlighted the importance of using such audits to assess how the school was functioning, what was working well, and what areas required improvement.</p> <p>The DoE added that each September, during the AH meetings and leadership development sessions, appraisal updates and reminders were provided. These sessions included a review of all relevant paperwork, processes, and systems that leaders were expected to follow. She also mentioned that reminders were given on how to align appraisal targets with School Improvement Plan (SIP) targets. she suggested that it could be useful to incorporate the discussion point into the September reminder sessions.</p>	DoE
--	---	-----

	<p><i>A LAC Chair asked whether merging the relational approach with the behaviour policy would result in a single policy for all schools or if individual schools would still need their own behaviour policies. She asked whether the implementation should be universal or tailored to each classroom.</i></p> <p>The DoI said there was a preference for a relational approach to behaviour and emphasised the importance of maintaining flexibility within that framework. She explained that if a school wished to implement systems such as house points, this would be acceptable provided it aligned with the relational ethos. The DoI noted that the current behaviour policy already allowed schools to adopt individual approaches, as long as they followed relational principles. The DoI highlighted that the Trust valued this flexibility across its schools, while maintaining a shared understanding that the relational approach was the foundation of their work with children.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the DoI for her contribution to the meeting.</p> <p><u>ACTION-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoSI (PH) to add himself as the Trust level strategic lead onto the attendance policy. • DoSI (PH) to provide brief narrative, actions taken- with the impact and analysis of data on persistent absence and PP- particularly where figures were above the national average. • DoE to add relational approach impact/behavior management to the September AH reminder session. 	
9.	<p>Focus: Overview of curriculum (Presentation and report circulated before the meeting)</p> <p>The DoE gave a summary of her report and presentation and the following comments and questions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DoE explained that the Trust had changed its approach to school improvement. Instead of directors leading the questioning and analysis, headteachers were now expected to take the lead in evaluating and reporting on their school's performance. This shift aimed to empower heads and reduce their reliance on the EIT. A new document, which Lizzie had been developing, would bring all relevant elements together and would be shared with heads in September. • The DoE highlighted the need for greater consistency within the EIT team, especially following the move to the hub model with three directors working under her leadership. She acknowledged that the directors had different styles and approaches, which made alignment essential. <p>Part II was taken</p> <p>The Chair thanked the DoE for her contribution to the meeting.</p>	
10.	<p>Focus: Verbal report on first unvalidated data outcomes</p> <p>The DoSI AK gave a brief data update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EYFS: 71% of pupils achieved a good level of development, up from 67% last year and above the national average of 67%. • Phonics (Year 1): 78% passed, up 1% from last year and in line with national. • Reading (KS2): 79% achieved the expected standard, up from 72% last year and above the national figure of 74%. Greater depth was 34% across the Trust, up from 28%. • Writing (KS2): 69% achieved the expected standard, up from 61% last year and close to the national figure of 72%. Greater depth was 11%, up 6%. • Maths (KS2): 75% achieved the expected standard, up from 61% last year. Greater depth was 23%. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined Reading, Writing, and Maths (RWM): 62% achieved the expected standard, up from 49% last year and in line with the national figure of 61%. Greater depth was 8%, up from 3%. <p>The DoSI noted that while some minor adjustments might occur following paper reviews, the overall picture was very positive, with significant improvements across all areas. He highlighted standout performances, including schools achieving 100% in some areas and Tedburn achieving 70% greater depth in maths. The DoSI confirmed that further analysis would follow in collaboration with individual schools.</p> <p><i>The GP asked if there was a way of spreading the positive news to Governors and Parents as it would be wonderful to celebrate the news.</i></p> <p>The DOSI said the data was not validated at present, but once validated, it could be shared.</p>	
11.	<p>Local Advisory Committees</p> <p>A LAC Chair shared a recent success from Morchard Bishop, where the school had successfully applied to use pupil premium funding to support a specific SEND area. This funding would provide a full-time teaching assistant, which she said would make a significant difference for both the children with SEND and the wider staff team by alleviating pressure.</p> <p>She also noted a positive development within their LAC, where they had appointed a new Trustee level governor, which she said would be able to take on flexible responsibilities and explore areas in more depth, helping to support the committee's work more effectively.</p>	
12.	<p>Ethos Minutes (Circulated via email to Trustees before the meeting)</p> <p>A LAC Chair explained that their committee had experienced a challenging period, including the loss of several members, which had impacted the work of the ethos committee. Despite these difficulties, they reported that a new headteacher had now started, and although a recent meeting had been postponed due to illness, the outlook for September was positive.</p> <p>The following highlights were taken from the LAC hub meeting minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview of children at Otterton School: Overwhelmingly positive. Drakes school also benefits with close links with church through Open the Book & visits by Rev'd Martin. • Broadhembury & Branscombe & Farway. SB reports that the RE Lead for Farway to support other schools. SIAMS inspection due at Broadhembury & branscombe • Ilington- Parent Governor attended SEGS session on Christian distinctiveness within the curriculum. Other SEGS meeting ongoing, although no Foundation Governor appointment (KW stands in). The AH for Ilington said that Sharon Lord had been actively involved, along with Catherine from the church and Vicar John, who had all taken part in meetings as part of the school's SIAMS group. RS had also been meeting and participating in this group. In addition, RS had been supporting the school's monitoring schedule, which formed part of the responsibilities overseen by Sharon Lord. As the school had not had an officially appointed foundation governor during this period, the team had followed the agreed timetable to ensure continuity. • Landscape- Vision: "To use the keys to unlock the very best of us" Monitoring was completed with the design and technology lead, who also led the pupil eco group. Discussions were held with the headteacher and pupils. The school's vision was well understood and clearly reflected in both curriculum and wider activities. • Harbertonford- Vision: "Learn, live, flourish"- It was noted that the PE lead found it difficult to talk about how the vision was reflected in teaching. The AH (Academy Headteacher) noted that 	

	<p>the staff had had spirituality training with Sharon Lord after this monitoring and he felt that the picture may be different following that training. This is something he will follow up on.</p> <p>The school were continuing to develop their 5* pledge which was looking really good.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diptford- Vision: “Let your light shine”- Pupils were able to talk about their work, identifying both strengths and areas for development when faced with challenges. They made clear links to the school’s values. During discussions, pupils demonstrated how they supported one another effectively. Monitoring showed that significant thought had been given to the design of both the curriculum and the wider offer. 	
13.	Action Plans (Circulated via email to Trustees before the meeting) Part II was taken.	
14.	<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>There were no safeguarding updates available for the meeting, due to the absence of the CEO, however the GP raised that GS would provide a report for the Board of Trustees meeting the following week.</p>	
15.	<p>Due Diligence</p> <p>There were no updates available for the meeting.</p> <p>There were no comments brought forward to the meeting.</p>	
16.	<p>Risk Register RAG review</p> <p>Trustees agreed that the risk register would be discussed at BoT on the way forward.</p>	
17.	<p>Policies</p> <p>17.1 Relationships Education Policy (To be deferred to the next S&C meeting)</p> <p>17.2 Behaviour in School (Relational Approach) policy</p> <p>17.3 Positive Handling Policy 2025</p> <p>Represented from previous meeting</p> <p>16.4 LINK Attendance Policy 2025.docx</p> <p>16.5 Children with health needs who cannot attend school 2025</p> <p>16.6 Teaching and Learning Policy</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that she and the GP would go through the related questions and comments and return their responses along with the minutes of the meeting. The Chair noted that there were several comments on the policies.</p> <p>A Trustee suggested that once the revised policies were recirculated, it would be helpful if trustees could approve or not approve them remotely. This would prevent the policies from accumulating and delaying decisions at the next meeting. The meeting agreed that this would be a practical approach.</p> <p>ACTION-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>CC/GP and KE to go through the above policies offline and circulate for Trustees approval via email.</u> • <u>CLERK to add Relationships Education Policy and Relational and Behaviour Approach policy- to the next S&C agenda.</u> 	<p>CLERK/GP</p> <p>GP/CC/KE/ CLERK</p>
19.	<p>Evaluation of governance impact</p> <p>The Chair suggested that the group should celebrate the positive results achieved across the schools, she highlighted the value of focus group presentations during meetings, such as sessions on PE and pupil premium. The Chair noted that, although some topics might be complex or unfamiliar to all attendees, the overviews provided by these presentations were appreciated and offered valuable insight into the Trust’s work.</p>	

	<p>A LAC Chair raised that while the volume of documents and reports shared ahead of meetings was useful, it might not be sustainable in the long term. She suggested reviewing which materials were prioritised for discussion to ensure meetings remained focused and manageable.</p> <p>The meeting agreed it would be useful to streamline the quantity of paperwork and to use the SharePoint folder more efficiently.</p>	
--	--	--

The meeting ended at 7pm

Signed by the Chair of the Committeeon

APPENDIX 1 (these questions were circulated 2 weeks prior to the meeting)

Report/Attachment	Question	Answer
Policies		
Relational approach	<p>Who is the introductory quote attributed to? (and the quote implies we make children feel worse currently – is this the best quote to choose?)</p> <p>Para 3 seems to have been overlaid over other text and hard to read as a result.</p>	I have attributed the quote but also changed it to another that is also in the Behaviour Policy
Positive Handling	<p>In the intro para the phrase should say '<i>reasonable force</i>'. (this phrase is used elsewhere)</p> <p>I feel strongly that ALL staff should receive basic overview training, cascaded from accredited trained staff, in order to be informed on what to expect, and to be informed witnesses.</p> <p>What happens 'in the moment' if the staff member is not trained?</p>	<p>I agree but this is a huge cost and timing implication, it is a full days training at approx. £60 per head and they will only take around 12 at a time as it is quite an intensive course if it is done properly. There are some online versions but you don't get the physical practice of trying it out. It has to be remembered that in the majority of schools it is never used. We always suggest when selecting staff that they should be full time staff and ideally a more senior member plus a TA who it is possible to call on.</p>
Attendance	<p>3.9 has missed 'parents'</p> <p>4.1 need to add what time the registers close AM and PM</p> <p>? Would it be helpful to have a list of circumstances that are NOT acceptable or authorizable for absence, or are these in a more informal parent leaflet?</p> <p>4.2 absence calling needs a time when this will be done (eg from register close to 10.00)</p>	

	<p>? Is it worth including that attendance records are now part of the pupil transition record for secondary school? It has made a big impact in some schools.</p> <p>P8 2.5, 2.7 and P 17 for pupils' responsibilities: pupils arriving late MUST be signed in by parents, not themselves: for primary schools parents are the ones responsible for getting pupils to school on time, not the pupils, and need to be held responsible (and make it more inconvenient for them, rather than let the child out of the car and drive away)</p> <p>2.6 is unclear – I think it means after lunch</p> <p>2.7 should office manager authorise leaving school? Should it not be AH or attendance leader?</p> <p>7.4 should it say ALL PA and AS pupils?</p> <p>? What about persistently late pupils? Particularly those pupils who walk to school alone?</p> <p>? Under 'responsibilities' is the attendance lead role strategic enough to make a difference? Office administrators can be the operational lead, but who will be the attendance Champions and strategic leads – with such small schools, should it be the AH?</p> <p>P21 table: 90% attendance should say 'could result' in legal action, rather than 'will result'.</p> <p>Request for EHE – should there always be a meeting with the AH to discuss?</p> <p>Pupil emigrates: should the list include copies of travel docs?</p> <p>Appendices Title word missing 'absence'</p>	
Behaviour Policy	<p>I like the table of contents</p> <p>Aims: 4 - 'take control of their behaviour...' could this read 'learn about, manage and regulate their own emotions and behaviour, its impact on themselves and others, and be responsible for consequences'?</p> <p>P2 who is the quote attributed to?</p> <p>Prevent is missing from the policy, or reference to prevent policy.</p>	<p>Agreed and changed to this</p> <p>Quote attributed (Mark Finniss)</p> <p>Prevent is now referred to</p>

Health Needs	<p>1.9 Plans reviewed at least annually – should this be more frequent? (conditions may improve or decline in a year making the planned arrangements no longer suitable.</p> <p>1.25 It is odd that this list is written in the negative: surely it should say what schools <i>should</i> do, not what they shouldn't do?</p>	<p>I feel this is clear it says 'at least annually' and 'if evidence is presented that the child's needs have changed' it should be sooner. This depends very much on the need.</p> <p>In this case I feel it is appropriate, this was agreed by myself and Alex Waterman</p>
DOSI school review pro forma	<p>It would be useful to know the trends for pupil numbers and pace of change over time.</p> <p>? What information is required by the DOSI ahead of the the meeting in order to prepare and to decide a possible priority focus? EG to ACs submit a pre-populated form ahead of the meeting, or is it presented / populated on the day? At what point can any 'mismatch' between school view and DOSI view be identified and so brought to the forefront of the visit?</p>	
Curriculum Intent	<p>? Approved March '25?</p> <p>Vision Statement: Suggested additional wording:</p> <p>'children leave having reached their full academic, social and artistic potential, with highest academic outcomes to flourish in their next phase of education.' This is in the diagram but not in the vision statement.</p> <p>P2 'character <i>and spiritual</i> development'</p> <p>'individual, local, national <i>and global</i>'</p>	
ATSIP health check	For the impact review, it would be helpful for this to be RAG rated.	
Relational approach impact	<p>CPOMS data 2025 – it would be helpful to see how this compares with 22-23</p> <p>Interesting to see behaviour still affecting the wellbeing of staff, when the intention of the RA approach was to be changing staff relationships and approaches as well as improving pupil behaviour – what is the thinking about this staff wellbeing issue, and the responses to the survey?</p> <p>Reduced timetables: how many last 6 weeks (half a term)? What are the expectations for catch up / keep up</p>	<p>I agree with wanting to see comparisons but I am currently unable to access this data myself and rely on Alex or Andy . Much of this will be sent via Alex W's safeguarding reports to Trustees as there is overlap here.</p> <p>I cannot specifically access this info currently, we are moving all CPOMS</p>

	<p>when not in school to prevent further disadvantage? What learning is prioritised when they are in school? What changes at school during the period of 'respite'?</p>	<p>records to CPOMS from September which will hopefully make it easier for me to pull a report together as this is not on SIMS. I would say the greater majority are at 6 weeks and may be extended as we do not use them lightly, they are used when a child is clearly overwhelmed in the school environment. The school is responsible for setting and marking work in this time out of school. In school the priority would be (depending on age and ability) their phonics, reading and maths, but very often broken down into small achievable chunks of learning. This may involve a visual timetable and 'now and next' so that they can have time to 'decompress' and have sensory breaks or activities as appropriate. Their learning would also be adapted to their need and they may have agreed adaptations such as use of ear defenders to reduce noise, or they may learn in a smaller space in the school, overseen by the teacher.</p>
--	---	---