

SEND Challenge Event June 2016

The event was designed to review the quality of finalised Education Health and Care Plans, both new plans and those which had transitioned from being statements of SEND to being EHCP's .

The event was designed following the experience of Lorraine Stephen HOS SEN and Complex Needs and Sue Woodgate Assistant Director SEN, Access and Inclusion when visiting a similar event in Derbyshire in April 2016.

The focus of the event was:

- To gain a view on the quality of plans when assessed against a tool developed from the DFE checklist.
- To ascertain whether there was a commonality of view as to what a good plan looked like.
- To look for improvements in the way that plans were constructed.

The participants in the event were drawn from across the EHCP world and included partners and parents.

- AD SEN Access and Inclusion
- HOS SEN
- SEN Principal Officers
- DCO
- DMO
- Salford College
- HOS CIN and CP
- School SENCO
- SIASS
- Virtual Head
- Startling Life Well Manager
- Special School Head Teacher
- Principal Educational Psychologist
- LSS Manager
- LSS VI team teacher
- Primary Head teacher
- Salford Parent voice
- Secondary School Deputy HT / SENCO,
- Dr Kathy Hamer
- Special School DHT
- Area SENCO
- Senior EP
- Colleagues from another LA.

- Admin Support form an SMSO

The process prior to the event.

Completed plans were selected randomly from the system. In this instance plans were printed hard copy but were not anonymous because it was decided that in order to make this a real exercise we had to invest professional trust in those who were taking part.

The evaluation tool was drafted by the AD to enable testing of the process to take place.

Three plans were evaluated by the AD using the tool to test the process and to refine and revise the tool.

Following the 3 initial audits the evaluation tool was revised and a scoring process devised which resulted in a % which could be compared equitably.

The tool was then used a further 3 times by the HOS SEN, the DHT from the secondary school and a parent rep to further test and refine prior to use at the event,

The tool used is embedded below.



EHCP Blank
Checklist.doc

At the events

The event was introduced by the AD outlining the process which was to be undertaken and explaining how to use the tool given that not all sections of the tool would apply to every plan.



Participants were asked to work in pairs; with someone from a different standpoint. The aspiration was that every plan would be evaluated 3 times by different pairing to test the consistency of views and robustness of process.

Practice suggested that it took much longer to evaluate the first plan than was anticipated so most plans were only

evaluated twice rather than 3 times.

All plans generated considerable discussion. This was recorded on the feedback sheets to enable them to be used proactively in generating suggestions to improve the process.

Completed feedback sheets were collated by the SMSO which helped us to keep track of which cases were being audited and to ensure that there was a range across



both new cases and those which had transitioned. This worked well but demonstrated the importance of the back office management function in this exercise, without this the exercise could easily have become challenging and outcomes less manageable.

In general the tool worked well and participants were able to do effective audits using them.

Given that there were a limited number of schools involved in the

first exercise it was undertaken a second time with school SENCo's at the SENCo conference later in June.

The Outcomes.

The outcome of the evaluation was that there is significant need for further development in the way that plans are written, and that we are some way from co-production.

The comments / issues – raised by participants were varied but it was very clear that there was significant information missing and that the plans were unclear making it very difficult to deliver provision using them.

Using the scoring tool very few plans scored more than 50% in terms of meeting expectations and the majority were significantly under that mark.

What was positive was that there is significant agreement across the audit teams about the quality of the plans and the gaps in the way in which they have been produced.

Sample Comments from throughout the Audit tool:

- Nothing about what the child wants, minimal as to what parents want.
- Lack of clarity on how parents came to this view.
- No parent/carer view
- No/limited short term listed

- Does not identify what child wants, states mum finds it hard to get him to school but does not identify this as a ST aim
- Lots of info but not clear if it is parents or young person.
- Excellent – get a real feel for the YP
- Good results in exams
- Very short focused would become out of date very quickly.
- Short term aspirations given around education but the evidence of short term aspirations mainly just highlight 'likes'
- Information there just not clear again who is providing the view
- Parents long term views included
- No long term info
- Does not identify what CYP wants just has long term wants from mum.
- Limited information between short term and long term hopes i.e. no mention of college to achieve his goal to become structural engineer
- Some evidence but not specific this evidence is only from parent not YP
- Child does not appear able to comment
- Vague and weak and no mention of what xxxxx wants for the future
- Wants to be mechanic no info on future aspirations
- Only gives diagnosis no detail on pre school
- No timeline (education)
- Not enough medical detail re illness and its impact on education
- No real history other than school and age – don't know why he has a plan
- No/brief history
- More about now in the history
- The only history relates to stating the name of his previous school
- Very brief no idea what his difficulties are!
- Quite detailed but did not include current health (if any)
- Nothing between birth and 3 and why/how he came to children's centre
- Parent provides info on child's early life/medical/education
- Clear but missing info
- We don't know anything
- A lot of info about current but none about history – why is he out of his family?
- Limited school detail, some on independence but not a great deal some prompts given
- Some about school, nothing about play, independence or friendships
- Not enough focus on independence and friendships
- Lots of good info but nothing on health
- Quite detailed although not much info on how independent he is presently could be more included about play and current health
- Detail given for all areas
- Not all health info included mentioned later in the plan

- Very little about friendship – possibly doesn't have a friendship group, lacks details of independence
- Although other children can become upset with XXXXXX we don't know why other than communication difficulties. How often?
- He obviously has difficulties around making friends – nothing mentioned on peer relations
- Doesn't make ref to employment
- Clear info on both education and employment
- Very limited
- Makes ref to high schools and employment however no ref to college
- Nothing long term past the next placement
- Not stated/ nothing specifics/limited info
- Gives some info on communication skills but not how xxxxx uses them and how to communicate with her
- States communicates verbally but hard to read faces, some other info
- No – just talks about using interaction, not stated if verbal/non verbal
- No communication strategy
- No evidence at all
- We don't know how to communicate with xxxxxxxx We don't know what his understanding is like.
- Considering his cognitive abilities, the information is limited
- Gives some information but lacks specific detail / need more clarity
- Some of the statements are inconsistent with the evidence/ contradict other statements
- Some/detailed/general strengths given
- A few strengths listed – but largely just character
- Yes does give quite ample info on strengths/good list of strengths
- Communication is good/detailed and useful other areas are poor
- Some info however more could be added to give a true reflection of what he is achieving at school
- Nothing on built upon some info appears to be contradictory see SEMH
- States difficulty with SAL however no report in appendixes.
- No evidence about what can be built on or what progress has been made and expected trajectory in terms of education or development
- Positive and varied
- Plenty of info on strengths which could be built on
- Not much on cognition and learning
- Sensory and physical is clear
- It does outline strengths well and although he is making good progress – is this in relation to him or on national expectation?
- No levels from school included. EPS tests are useful but do not show how is he doing in school.

- Nothing evident / No info provided
- EYFS goals could be added in/ no EYFS tracker info
- P levels included
- Gives some detail but not specific levels / Very limited
- No attainment levels
- Current attainment is listed in the special needs
- Clear and easy to read
- No timescale for limited data provided
- No apart from EP assessments
- Detail is contradictory e.g. 'some learning difficulties' but then goes on to state she is on 1st centile
- Includes self help skills and independence.
- Verbal/non verbal assessments
- NC assessments
- Descriptive but no measure
- Can't tell learning levels
- Included in needs section for reading, writing and maths – limited
- Assessment results over 2 years old. If we were a parent reading this we would be very unhappy – basically it is out of date. No standardised assessments from school. How do we measure progress?
- Yes needs are clear
- Some needs specific some are not.
- Specific Speech and Language. Different in moving around school. Managing emotions. Not specific – relation to his illness.
- Some needs in wrong areas
- C&I is good
- Weak on SEMH
- Some irrelevant info
- Communication and SEMH – one need contradicts a strength
- Some are descriptions of what he would rather than the actual need
- Behaviour needs not at all clear
- A lot of info given around his pseb however little info around his actual SEN needs/curriculum needs. Not clearly set out, info goes from his past to the present then back to the past.
- Health needs state no needs but then it is referenced to needs in provision.
- Referral isn't a need
- Section C should not include SEN

Next Steps

It was clear that further work on the methodology and practice around the development of EHCP's was required.

This was undertaken by the SEN team and has produced additional guidance which simplifies and clarifies how plans should be constructed so that they are detailed and meet requirements.



Draft EHCP with
guidance notes ii (2).doc