**Bracknell Forest Council**



|  |
| --- |
| **SEND Review Tool** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Completed by** | Jade Faircloth (Infant School SENDCo) Assistant Head of Inclusion |
| **Date** | 22/03/2018 14th March 2019 |
| **Number of pupils on SEND register** | 74 |
| **Total number of hours (SENDCO)** | 1 ½ days release from Infant School Full Time SENDCO |
| **Additional qualifications** | Emotional First Aid, Elklan, Autism |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LEADERSHIP** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| The SENCO has completed the National Award for SEN Coordinators (NASENCO) From Infants |  |  | \* ✓ |
| The SENDCO is on the Senior Leadership Team From Infants |  |  | \* ✓ |
| The SENDCO regularly informs SLT on current SEND policy and practice From Infants |  |  | \*✓ |
| The SENDCO has a clear vision for SEND provision and outcomes in the school From Infants |  |  | \*✓ |
| The SEND information report meets the legal requirements and is published on the school website  The report that is published on the website is out of date and does not reflect the appropriate level of provision or interventions/resources that is on offer within the context of the school. Rewritten and published September 2018-then updated in May 2019. |  | \* | ✓ |
| As part of the school Improvement Plan there is a SEND development plan in place with clear aims and objectives  The school improvement plan at present is focussed on driving up standards of Quality First Teaching and ensuring that children make progress in Maths in particular. Focus on Pre-Key Stage Standards and development of appropriate curriculum to support SEND learners.  Focu | \* | ✓ |  |
| The SENDCO is involved with making decisions about staff deployment and the use of resources for SEND  However, this is not fully implemented across the school as intervention groups or needs led provision. TAs support children within the class-often several TAs are teaching the same intervention rather than pooling resources and staffing. Interventions are delivered that are suitable to meet the needs of the children and are monitored by the SENCo to see effectiveness and progress. Needs led provision is evident and children are supported where appropriate. |  |  | \*✓ |
| A lead governor for SEND has been identified and is briefed regularly by the SENCO  A lead SEN governor has been newly appointed and has begun conducting learning walks and looking at spelling homework for SEN children. Action planner needs to be shared and discussed. |  | \*✓ |  |
| The lead SEND governor systematically challenges leaders about their learning and progress of pupils with SEND and the efficient use of resources  As above  SEND governor is more visible in school and conducts learning walks to ascertain progress. |  | \* | ✓ |
| SEND provision (including roles of staff) is clearly articulated and understood by all  SEND Provision is non-existent. Needs are decided upon by each individual class teacher and then TA are to deliver interventions within the class. This is not shared across a year group or a key stage. There are no Wave 2 or Wave 3 interventions or resources to support quality first teaching.  SEND Provision has significantly improved but has room for further improvement. This is to be developed by reintroducing the SEND newsletter each term. Wave 2 and 3 interventions have begun to be implemented where appropriate. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Staff CPD needs in regard to SEND are accurately identified; relevant and ongoing training is in place (including for TAs)  There is no evidence of any staff having any CPD in SEN, SALT and early identification. SEND Insets have been delivered linked to the code of practice and differentiation. Future planning for this is for teachers to bring children with complex needs to Inset sessions where they can share ideas and strategies to support one another. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The performance management system is used to improve outcomes for pupils with SEND  Until recently there has been no performance management of any kind-in particular focussing on improving outcomes for children.  Performance management across the school has been introduced using 1265. Pupil progress meetings planned for next year. | \* |  | ✓ |
| The SENDCO has sufficient non-contact time to perform their role (and resources to carry out these functions). This should include providing the SENDCO with sufficient administrative support and time away from teaching to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities in a similar way to other important strategic roles within a school COP para 6.91 N/A-Infants  Full time role-Spring and Summer Term teaching responsibility for Squirrel Class Year 2 (mainly SEND children) |  |  | ✓ |

**Outstanding’ grade descriptors**

* Leaders demonstrate an uncompromising and highly successful drive to strongly Improve, or maintain, the highest levels of achievement and personal development for pupils with SEND.
* Leaders are highly ambitious for pupils with SEND and lead by example.
* Governors stringently hold Senior leaders to account for the quality of SEND provision and outcomes for pupils with SEND.
* Leaders focus relentlessly on improving teaching and learning for pupils with SEND and provide focussed professional development for all staff in this area.
* Governors ensure the effective and efficient management of financial resources for SEND. This leads to the excellent deployment of staff and resources to the benefit of pupils with SEND.

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| * The SENDCo is appropriately qualified and alongside the executive head has high expectations of meeting the needs of children with SEN. Both SENDCo and executive strive for all staff to think of the needs of all learners and appropriately challenge staff to evaluate the effectiveness of the provision provided. * Extensive work has been put into developing the appropriate provision and quality of teaching to support all learners. SLT (including the SENCo) work together alongside curriculum leads to ensure that there is a high quality curriculum delivered to engage all abilities. |
| Areas for development |
| * SEN Provision is not evident or not appropriate as should be Wave 1: Quality First Teaching. Continue to develop QFT and further enhance Wave 1 and Wave 2 Provision. * Staff CPD has historically been non-existent and staff are not aware of the new code of practice which clearly states that every class teacher is responsible for SEN. Continue to develop CPD with SEND newsletters and Inset sessions where teachers can bring pupils that other teachers and SENCo can support in planning appropriate provision and differentiation. * Performance management has not been previously used to improve outcomes for children with SEN. Met. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IDENTIFICATION** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| Class teachers work effectively with the SENDCO to support accurate and early identification  Class teachers do not take ownership of children in their class for SEN. They are not aware of the new code of practice and think that the SENDCo is responsible for timetabling, monitoring and marking work that children in their class complete. They are not aware of the progress that each child is making with SEN and do not write appropriate targets on IEPs, action plans or appear knowledgeable to external agencies that come in to support the children with additional needs. Teachers are more aware of the profile of their class and how some barriers to learning can impact their progress. Teachers are not yet proactive in communicating with TAs who deliver interventions and use this information to support pupils in class. Teachers still seek out testing and ‘quick fix’ strategies rather than looking at the bigger picture. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The SENDCO liaises with parents, schools and outside agencies to ensure accurate and early identification  The previous SENDCo has worked hard to begin to develop positive relationships with parents, to gain trust and develop parental involvement. This will continue when parents feel that the level of provision meets the needs of the children at an appropriate level. Chronology has been put in place for nearly all children with additional needs. This needs to be consistently monitored and updated by all staff. |  | \*✓ |  |
| TAs and additional staff are used to support the identification process  No evidence of this.  TAs contribute as necessary to identification of additional needs-particularly through ELSA work. | \* |  | ✓ |
| The SENDCO uses specialists such as EP to support the identification process  The SENDCo meets with the EP to discuss children through the planning stage of the consultation and children with particular needs are identified for further observation. As this is a new approach from the LA, the role and procedures are evolving and developing as the year progresses.  Evidenced through chronology and evaluations. |  | \* | ✓ |
| The effectiveness of high quality classroom teaching is taken into account before assuming a pupil has SEND  Lesson observations and monitoring are not evident in terms of monitoring children with SEN. This is also evident in children’s IEPs as targets that have been written do not support children making individual progress. Targets that are written should be addressed within Quality First Teaching and are not appropriate SMART targets.  This has significantly improved since new staff members were employed in Key Stage 2-this is now across the whole school. | \* |  | ✓ |
| The school has a written rationale that is used as guidance when identifying pupils as having a special educational need  There is an SEN report and a SEN policy, however, both of these documents are out of date and are not specifically clear on what teachers should do to identify children with SEN. Both documents heavily state the role of the SENDCo in terms of identifying children rather than in keeping with the new Code of Practice that clearly states all teachers are teachers of SEN and are responsible for the assess, plan, do and review cycle.  Both policy and local offer has been updated to reflect current practice and ethos for the school and Inclusion. | \* |  | ✓ |
| The SEND register is accurate and reviewed regularly  The SEND register is reviewed in line with the census. New children need to be checked on arrival to determine whether the paperwork from previous settings are accurate.  This is checked and updated each term. |  | \* | ✓ |
| The SENDCO has confidence is recognising when a pupil may need to be assessed |  |  | ✓ |
| A range of diagnostic assessments are available to support accurate screening for SEND  This was non-existent until the Executive Head started to buy in assessments to support children, we are now using the resources and assessments that the Infant School have to further support and screen SEND children.  These are used when needed by the SENCo to screen children. |  | \* | ✓ |
| Parents, carers and children are involved at the start of the identification process  Relationships between parents, children and staff are beginning to become more effective. However, this is still with the SENDCo rather than class teachers leading the identification process or driving forward meetings. Teachers still look to the SENDCo to conduct meetings and speak to parents regarding individual children-which then shows limited understanding of each child within their class. Teachers need to take a more active role in this to show that they understand the needs of the learners and how they can support them within the classroom. Teachers still need to take ownership of their class rather than refer straight to the SENCo-this is more evident in Key Stage 2. |  | \*✓ |  |

**‘Outstanding’ grade descriptors**

* Early identification of pupils’ needs is effective.
* As a result of early and accurate identification, provision for pupils with SEND is put in place quickly and efficiently.

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| Provision for pupils with a range of needs is put into place quickly and on paper looks to meet the individuals needs effectively.  Children are identified quickly and assessments carried out as appropriate. |
| **Areas for development** |
| Identification of children with SEN is weak, targets that are set on IEPs are not SMART targets and the majority could be reviewed through quality first teaching. As before, there is great expectation put upon the SENDCo to be responsible for identification, screening and monitoring rather than teachers driving forward the standards and modelling high expectations to all learners within the classroom. Met    The provision that is put in place for children with a range of needs is not fully supported by the class teacher. Either teachers do not enforce the timetable, or query any discrepancies or the class teacher is not following recommendations or implementing strategies that have been recommended by the SENDCo or external multi-agency professionals. This makes continuing to support and identify children’s needs extremely challenging and presents mixed messages to parents. Parents are still not included in this process. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TRACKING AND MONITORING PROGRESS** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| The SENDCO AND SLT have a clear understanding of the attainment and progress of pupils with SEND and how these compare with national figures and with other pupils in the School  No evidence of this. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The School monitors the progress of pupils with SEND sub-groups such as Cognition and Learning, SEMH etc., as well as monitoring progress within subjects  No evidence of this. There is no tracking tool like SPTO to ascertain the progress of children within separate sub groups. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The School produces regular reports of the progress of pupils with SEND  No evidence of this. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The school uses achievement and progress data to inform planning and interventions  No evidence of this. Children’s IEP targets are not SMART targets or linked to any relevant achievement or progress and should be addressed through Quality First Teaching.  Extensive work has been focussed on appropriateness of IEPs and their targets-further work now needs to be focussed on ensuring that targets on IEPs are actually met and the provision is implemented. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The report on the progress of individual pupils with SEND are shared with staff and used to target support  No evidence of this. | \* |  |  |
| Pupils with SEND are set challenging progress targets taking into account national expectations and Progression Guidance  No evidence of this. | \* |  |  |
| Standardised/diagnostic assessments e.g. reading ages are sued to further track and monitor progress of pupils with SEND  There is no use of standardised/diagnostic assessments in place. Support for Learning has not been bought into and the Executive Head has now enlisted their services through a bespoke package. | \* | ✓ |  |
| A provision map is in place to support the coordination of interventions  There is a provision map to support coordination of interventions, however, this is not adhered too and location/roles of staff seem to be constantly changing so locating interventions and when they are taking place are virtually impossible. | \* | ✓ |  |
| There is an appropriate balance between in-class, group and individual support  There is some support for individuals-although this is not always appropriate or linked to children’s specific targets. From walk rounds-teachers do not always work with/support SEN children within the class, often putting children with the least experienced member of staff. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The SENDCO uses evidence-based interventions  There is only one evidence based intervention used within school, however progress is not monitored and staff delivering the intervention do not know how to assess progress being made. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Support is informed and delivered by adults who understand pupil needs and know pupil targets  There is no evidence of grouping children to run effective interventions across a Key Stage or year group, instead the class teacher is supposed to identify children and then direct the TA to deliver an intervention. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The impact of TAs is reviewed regularly through learning walks and observation  No evidence of this. This will be a focus during the Summer Term. | \* | ✓ |  |
| TAs monitor the progress of pupils with SEND during classroom support/intervention  There is no evidence that shows record keeping or monitoring of either the effectiveness of the intervention or the starting, mid or end point of each child. Where interventions are being delivered (Toe by Toe) there are no notes that are fed back to the class teacher against learning intentions or outcomes. TAs delivering specific interventions feed information about progress and any concerns to the class teacher and the SENCo. Teachers, however, need to be more proactive in using this information appropriately and effectively. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The Assess, Plan, Do, Review Approach is embedded for every pupil with SEND  This is not used-staff are not informed/aware of the new code of practice.  Staff have received training on the Code of Practice and are aware of the expectation to use this cycle. | \* | ✓ |  |
| All children are assessed and their progress tracked using systems that provide clear information to class teachers  There is no assessment or tracking of any intervention.  Interventions are now monitored using a baseline, mid-point and end assessment point. | \* |  | ✓ |
| Targets are appropriate, pupils understand them and they know how to achieve them  Targets are mainly inappropriate and the steps that need to be taken are unachievable. Targets are not set in line with the new code of practice and are not SMART.  Where children have an EHC plan-these targets are more specific-however these targets have already been predetermined at SEN panel meetings.  Targets are more appropriate-Teachers now need to ensure that they are providing the opportunities to the children in order to meet these targets. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Data is used to monitor and evaluate the impact of strategies and interventions/provision  No evidence of any data or monitoring of the interventions or strategies that have been used. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Class teachers remain responsible for the teaching and progress of the child. Teachers teach SEN groups (at least occasionally – to ensure awareness of issues and progress).  Class teachers are still responsible for teaching and the progress made by each individual child, however, when questioned about children with SEN in their class the majority are not aware of their targets or individual needs. Comments made about the children are very vague and impersonal.  It is not evident how often teachers teach the SEN groups within their class. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Phonics and reading provision are based on sound principles and remediation is provided regularly (minimum of 3x pw) and systematically using a variety of resources  No evidence of this.  When ERIC is taking place, some teachers do not listen to priority readers and do not value the importance of hearing/understanding what difficulties the children in class may present with when reading. Many feel that if a child is having Toe by Toe Intervention then they do not need to read again after lunch. This is not the case-as children who are having interventions need to be heard read much more to develop sight vocabulary, fluency and confidence. | \* | ✓ |  |
| All classroom staff (including teachers) have completed awareness raising training around dyslexia and SLCN and have implemented some of the recommendations  No evidence of this.  Further CPD | \*✓ |  |  |
| Where necessary ensure staff receive appropriate training to support pupils with medical needs  No evidence of this.  Staff members are currently undergoing training to support children with diabetes. | \* | ✓ |  |

**Outstanding grade descriptors**

* Pupils with SEND make substantial and sustained progress throughout year groups across many subjects including English and Mathematics, and learn exceptionally well.
* From each different starting point, the proportions of pupils with SEND making at least expected progress in English and mathematics are high compared with other pupils nationally and in the school.
* Pupils with SEND acquire knowledge and develop and apply a wide range of skills to great effect in reading, writing, communication and mathematics. They are exceptionally well prepared for the next stage in their education, training and employment.
* The learning of pupils with special educational needs is consistently good or better.
* There are excellent improvements in behaviour over time for individuals or groups with particular behaviour needs.
* Where there are gaps in attainment between pupils with SEND and other pupils, this gap is closing rapidly.

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| Children with EHC plans have appropriate targets and are largely implemented.  New IEPs etc. have been implemented which show teachers now know their children quite well, targets set are SMART targets and are more achievable. |
| **Areas for development** |
| There is no evidence that shows record keeping or monitoring of either the effectiveness of the intervention or the starting, mid or end point of each child. Where interventions are being delivered (Toe by Toe) there are no notes that are fed back to the class teacher against learning intentions or outcomes.  Targets are mainly inappropriate and the steps that need to be taken are unachievable. Targets are not set in line with the new code of practice and are not SMART. Met-this is now a strength.  Class teachers are still responsible for teaching and the progress made by each individual child, however, when questioned about children with SEN in their class the majority are not aware of their targets or individual needs. Comments made about the children are very vague and impersonal.  It is not evident how often teachers teach the SEN groups within their class. Teachers still need to take responsibility for their children and be proactive in speaking to and acting on evidence provided by teaching assistants who are delivering interventions, particularly ELSA. Information being passed on is not always acted upon in class. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HIGH QUALITY TEACHING AND INTERVENTION** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| All staff understand their role and responsibilities in respect of SEND and vulnerable pupils  Staff are not aware of the new code of practice and think the responsibility of children with SEND lies with the SENDCo. Teachers do not think consistently about their pupils, particularly those with high need SEN or those using the Learning Hub. | \*✓ |  |  |
| Class teacher resources and planning are adjusted to support pupils with SEND as part of high quality teaching  There has been no evidence of this. On a walk round looking at spelling, only 3 children with SEND were visibly seen to have suitable resources to support their work across the whole school. Teachers still do plan appropriately for children with SEND particularly those children using the Learning Hub. | \*✓ |  |  |
| Class teachers are confident in delivering high quality teaching to meet the needs of pupils with SEND  No evidence of this.  Ongoing 2019-2020 | \*✓ |  |  |
| The SENDCO works alongside class teachers to support differentiation and curriculum development  The outgoing SENDCo is highly effective in supporting teachers to meet the needs of each child with SEN, she offers strategies, resources and advice where necessary. However, this is not consistently implemented across the school. On children’s individual action plans, the SENDCo began writing questions to class teachers to determine the level of effectiveness and understanding around individual children-however staff are not consistent in answering these questions fully. |  | \*✓ |  |
| The SENDCO regularly evaluates the quality of teaching for pupils with SEND  No evidence of this.  This has been more challenging in the spring and summer term due to additional teaching commitments. | \* | ✓ |  |
| A provision map is in place to support the coordination of interventions  There is a provision map to support coordination of interventions, however, this is not adhered too and location/roles of staff seem to be constantly changing so locating interventions and when they are taking place are virtually impossible. | \* | ✓ |  |
| There is an appropriate balance between in-class, group and individual support  There is some support for individuals-although this is not always appropriate or linked to children’s specific targets. From walk rounds-teachers do not always work with/support SEN children within the class, often putting children with the least experienced member of staff. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The SENDCO uses evidence-based interventions  There is only one evidence based intervention used within school, however progress is not monitored and staff delivering the intervention do not know how to assess progress being made. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Support is informed and delivered by adults who understand pupil needs and know pupil targets  No evidence of this. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The impact of TAs is reviewed regularly through learning walks and observation  No evidence of this.  Progress of children in the Learning Hub. | \* | ✓ |  |
| TAs monitor the progress of pupils with SEND during classroom support/intervention  There is no evidence that shows record keeping or monitoring of either the effectiveness of the intervention or the starting, mid or end point of each child. Where interventions are being delivered (Toe by Toe) there are no notes that are fed back to the class teacher against learning intentions or outcomes. | \*✓ |  |  |
| The Assess, Plan, Do, Review Approach is embedded for every pupil with SEND  This is not used-staff are not informed/aware of the new code of practice. | \*✓ |  |  |

**‘Outstanding’ grade descriptors**

* Much teaching for pupils with SEND in all key stages and most subjects is outstanding and never less than consistently good. As a result, pupils with SEND are making sustained progress that leads to outstanding achievement.
* All teachers have consistently high expectations of pupils with SEND. They plan and teach lessons that enable pupils to learn exceptionally well across the curriculum.
* Teachers use well-judged teaching strategies that, together with clearly directed and timely support and intervention, match pupils’ needs accurately.
* Additional adults are deployed effectively to support pupils’ learning.
* The use of evidence-based interventions has a significant impact on the attainment and progress of pupils with SEND.

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| The current SENDCo is knowledgeable and efficient in supporting staff to support the needs of learners within the class. She is able to offer advice, strategies and resources that can further support both staff and children. |
| **Areas for development** |
| Staff need to take more responsibility to follow the new code, in particular, the assess, plan, do and review cycle. Teachers need to follow and implement resources and strategies given to them by both the SENDCo and multi-agency professionals, there needs to be more responsibility and accountability on individual teachers to review and monitor these strategies-if these are given to the teachers to implement it is because there is a need for it to happen, they are not optional and the teacher needs to follow the assess, plan, do, review cycle in order to justify why they have not worked or are not being used. Teachers need to be more accountable for evidence gathering in terms of children’s progress which in turn will enable them to talk confidently about the learners within their class. Continue to work on this. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPING PROVISION** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| Alternative packages of support are available for pupils with SEND as part of a personalised curriculum e.g. Nurture group provision, off-site provision, support for mental health  There is the use of a Nurture Room, ELSA and play therapy where appropriate.  There is now the Learning Hub, Recreation Room, ELSA, therapeutic Sports work, Eco rangers and a specific room for Play Therapy when appropriate. In September parenting workshops will be run to support children and their parents at home. |  | \* | ✓ |
| Where alternative provision is used, the school monitors the quality and impact of pupil progress  As with other interventions, the impact of this needs to be monitored either through specific learning intentions or through outcome based observations/evaluations to monitor progress.  The SENCo has begun monitoring interventions through individual intervention and through monitoring progress in core subjects. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Additional support for pupils with SEND is provided for transition  No evidence of this-however I have contacted Sandhurst and alternative provisions to establish links.  Additional transition is now in place to support children moving to secondary school. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The school is proactive in ensuring that parents/carers of pupils with SEND are well informed and develops opportunities to hear their views  Parent views have not been listened to in the past and parents need to feel more valued and supported.  This is being developed through parent meetings, training opportunities and letters home. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The school, child and parents/carers work in partnership to achieve genuine co-production e.g. for pupils with EHC plans  Relationships with children, parents and the SENDCo have developed considerably to achieve co-production of EHC plans. However, class teacher involvement is limited and teachers are slow to implement strategies to support the evidence gathering process of the plan. |  | \* | ✓ |
| The school has developed on-site expertise to meet a range of needs  It is not evident what expertise staff have or what training they have had to meet the needs of children. There is an FSA, who might not be used effectively or using her expertise. It is not evident what additional training she has had so is she being utilised? Whether this is through parenting workshops, ELSA groups or nurture groups.  Training sessions have been delivered by SALT and OT when needed. In September the Open Learning Centre are delivering parenting sessions for parents and their children to support anxiety. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Outside agency support is engaged appropriately and utilised effectively  The school have not bought into Support for Learning until the Executive Head arranged a bespoke package. ASSC service is used and strategies are beginning to be implemented as appropriate.  School have bought into the EP service, the ASSc service and Support for Learning. |  | \*✓ |  |
| Outside agency support is high quality and helps to improve pupil outcomes  This has only begun to be used so it is not evident if pupil outcomes have improved yet.  Support for Learning have worked 1:1 with one Year 6 pupil to support her learning. | \* | ✓ |  |
| The SENDCO has made effective links with a range of schools and SEND organisations.  Infant SENDCo is the SEN Lead for the local authority, so is developing a bank of expertise that can be drawn upon to support and link up with. As above-also from additional Hub and forums. |  | \* | ✓ |

**Outstanding grade descriptors**

* The school’s curriculum contributes very well to the academic achievement of pupils’ with SEND, their physical well-being, and their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.
* The school has highly successful strategies for engaging with parents of pupils with SEND
* The school works in partnership with other schools, external agencies and the community to increase the range and quality of learning opportunities for pupils with SEND.

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| Relationships with children, parents and the SENDCo have developed considerably to achieve co-production of EHC plans. However, class teacher involvement is limited and teachers are slow to implement strategies to support the evidence gathering process of the plan. |
| **Areas for development** |
| Continued monitoring and development of additional packages of support. Ongoing  Effective deployment of support staff using skills or training that they have to utilise their training. Ongoing  Listen to parents/carers to ensure that pupil needs and voice are being met. Log all conversations as points of reference and chronology. Ongoing  Develop strong and effective links ready for transition to support SEND and vulnerable groups. Met. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL AND FURTHER KEY ISSUES** | **NOT EVIDENT** | **DEVELOPING** | **SECURE** |
| The whole school environment is supportive  Display lettering is very unclear and ‘busy’ around the school. This makes reading titles extremely difficult as there is a lot of background noise. There is no consistent font size or type face(s) so there is little consistency in displays. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Classroom environments are supportive (Dyslexia/Autism Friendly)  Many classrooms are cluttered and the displays have ‘busy’ and distracting type-faces that are hard to read for an adult let alone children with Dyslexia or Autism.  There are no examples of key words for spelling, number lines etc. to support children.  Resources are not clearly labelled and grouped by colours e.g. red for maths, blue for literacy.  Homework is not printed on buff paper for children who have visual stress. | \* | ✓ |  |
| There is space provided for pupils to work quietly, with no distractions  There are many working spaces-however, these are in corridors, alcoves or small corners. There is also a Nurture room but as this is used as the after school club base, the walls are quite busy and could be easily distracting. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Systems to support positive behaviour are working effectively  No evidence of how the behaviour policy is implemented.  Needs more consistency and communication in Upper Key Stage 2. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Behaviour logs are carefully monitored  No evidence of this.  SLT routinely do this and act on any comments logged. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Bullying of pupils with SEND does not occur and/ or dealt with effectively  No evidence of this.  As above. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Transitions are well managed – perhaps even a transition leader  No evidence of this.  Year 6 pupils have additional transition days as needed. Year 6 teachers communicate effectively with SENCo, office and SLT to ensure that leaders are aware of additional transition. | \* | ✓ |  |
| Effective strategies are in place to improve attendance and reduce persistent absence  There is the support of the EWO and FITT workers and they advise and support where necessary.  As above. |  | \* ✓ |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Areas of strength** |
| There is an available EWO where appropriate.  Classrooms now are more visually accessible, as is the majority of the school site. |
| **Areas for development** |
| Visual access for all learners is very hard to access. Display lettering is unclear to read and due to the patterns/colours/extra detail on the lettering this makes it extremely difficult to read. Shiny laminating pouches reflect off the lights so there is also a glare on the lettering-again making for challenging reading. Classrooms do not appear to be Dyslexia friendly and do not have specific items like high frequency words, number lines, days of the week etc. to support reading and spelling. Classrooms are now more uniform in their displays and type face. Internal consistencies are monitored and acted upon when they fall below standards.  Classroom resources are not clearly labelled with either labels or pictures to support all learners in accessing resources within the classroom. Met |