



SENCo’s Annual Report to Governors: Based on April 2014 Draft SEN CoP

(this can also serve as a Self-Evaluation of the school’s SEN provision)

Name of School: Kenmore Park Infant & Nursery School Inclusion Manager: J Snowden
Date of report: January 2017 SEN Governor: Rimple Goel

Overall statement based upon Ofsted descriptors regarding the quality of the SEND provision in the school for the past 12 months: (i.e. is quality outstanding, good, requires improvement?)

Taking into account;

- *Outcomes of SEND pupils*

From a low base, children who receive interventions tend to make good progress – especially in Y2.

- *Quality of Teaching & Learning for SEND pupils*

Evidence demonstrates that the interventions we run have a positive impact. There are issues to resolve given ‘life without levels. Observations of support staff have shown some excellent practice. Whole-class teaching is carefully differentiated – and this will be a continued area of development for school.

- *Standard of behavior of SEND pupils*

Behaviour figures were much worse this year than last (see separate report on behavior for greater detail.)

Analysis of the figures demonstrated that the majority of behavior incidents were due to a small number of pupils. In general, behavior remains good.

- *Quality of Leadership & Management of SEND provision*

SEN governor continues to offer support in the role as ‘critical friend.’

The school gained the Inclusion Quality Mark in June 2015 and was considered a ‘Centre of Excellence’ for the 2nd year running.

I therefore adjudge that the school’s SEND provision to be good – however, through our on-going self-evaluation processes we are aware there will always be areas identified for us to develop.

SEND Profile (SEND register etc.) for past 12 months

Provide statistical information e.g.

	Number in receipt of EHC Plan	Number on SEN register ‘SEN Support’ /Statement	Number being Monitored /in receipt of Internal Intervention	Number of children who were in receipt of SALT	(Main) Area of Need			
					Communication & Interaction	Sensory &/or Physical Needs	Cognition & Learning	Social, Emotional & Mental health
Nursery	0	4	0	3	3	1		
Reception	1	6	3	6	6			
Y1	1	15	17	5	5	2	9	
Y2	1	22	19	9	9	3	10	
Total	3	47	39	23	23	6	19	

Number of children designated as ‘SEN Support’ (previously designated as School Action + or in receipt of a statement) and including children with an Education Health and Care Plan =50 as opposed to 44 last year.

The number of children on the SEN register is still below the numbers seen in the school prior to the introduction of the SEN Code of Practice in July 2014 due to the single category of ‘SEN Support’.

The number may still appear high compared to some schools given the Inclusion Manager’s decision to count children in receipt of FFT (Fischer Family Trust), our most intensive Literacy Intervention, as being SEN (based

on the definition of SEN as children receiving something different from and in addition to...)

Communication and Interaction remains our highest area of need. The number of children requiring Speech and Language Therapist input tends to hover around the 20 mark though this changes as children move on and off the Therapist's caseload. The needs in the school were considered great enough to require another Speech & Language Therapist to come into school in addition to our attached-SALT's hours.

This may, in turn, alter again this coming year – the SALT team is experiencing greater-than-ever levels of demand. This means children whose needs suggested they needed x number of sessions per term are having the number of sessions reduced. Children who are entering into the school in Reception have their sessions protected as do the children who are on the Autism pathway.

It is worth noting, too, that this situation may become worse in the coming year 2016/17. Our attached SALT has informed us that children who are designated as 'Targeted' (meaning with some targeted support from a SALT and follow-up support from school staff the children's needs are likely to be adequately met) will no longer receive support from the service.

The number of children presenting with ASD-like-traits continues to increase. 3 children in Y1 have now been identified as having ASD. In Reception, 2 children were on the school's roll for a period of time both of whom had ASD to a significant degree. One child transferred to a school with an attached unit, having made exceptional progress at the school. The other's needs were so severe that we were not able to accommodate him in school at all. In Nursery, 3 children are presenting with ASD-like symptoms – one is unlikely to be able to be supported by the school long-term.

Attainment at the end of the Key Stage 1 – percentages – data taken from Raise on Line

	Reading – At least expected standard		Reading - Greater Depth		Writing – At least expected standard		Writing – Greater Depth		Maths – At least expected standard		Maths – Greater Depth	
	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National
Y2												
SEN with EHCP	100% (1)	74%	0%	24%	100% (1)	65%	0%	13%	0%	73%	0%	18%
SEN Support	38%	74%	5%	24%	38%	65%	0%	13%	38%	73%	5%	18%
No SEN	83%	82%	33%	27%	85%	73%	12%	15%	83%	80%	38%	20%

FFT – Fischer Family Trust – Wave 3 Reading & Writing Intervention

Description:

FFT is a wave 3 programme taught 1:1. Children receive 4x20min sessions a week

Y2

Number of Children on Intervention: 21 children – split between 4 Teaching Assistants. This year, there was more movement between the more intensive FFT programme and the 'lighter touch' LCU.

The data below is focused on the 15 children who either started the year on the programme or who joined it in January after staff noted less-than-expected progress on LCU. Similarly, children who were receiving FFT and were transferred to LCU in January are included in the LCU data.

One child began the programme but it was decided his level of learning made inclusion on the programme

impossible. He has since been awarded an Education Health and Care Plan in Y3 following a request from Kenmore Park Infant & Nursery School submitted in Summer Term 2016.

Outcomes - Progress (Reading & writing) 3 points would be expected/good progress according to the school's tracking system. Anything above would be very good/outstanding progress

Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Reading score at end of year	Writing score at end of year	Progress in Reading	Progress in Writing	Comments
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	17	17	20	20	3	3	
■	17	18	20	20	3	2	EHCP referral was in process following limited progress – 15 hrs of support in Sum term
■	18	18	22	21	4	3	
■	16	16	18	18	2	2	Diagnosed with further medical condition in Y3 which had not been diagnosed in Y2; known to SALT & EP service; EIS had involvement and further support was requested this year and declined
■	18	19	19	19	1	0	Diagnosed with a medical condition mid-year; missed school; had done the programme in Y1 and had made good progress
■	16	14	20	21	4	5	
■	17	16	21	20	4	4	Concerns over possible health conditions; known to SALT and EP
■	18	17	19	18	1	1	EHCP request turned down Spr 2016; CAMHS request bounced;
■	17	17	20	21	3	4	
■	17	17	20	20	3	3	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	Known to OT;
■	18	17	21	21	3	4	
■	18	18	21	21	3	3	Child in Need (CIN)

Staff illness – 2 members of staff delivering the programme were off for significant periods of time – this meant the children they were seeing were taken on by other members of staff and in some cases, there was no option but to reduce the number of sessions the children received. Given the vulnerabilities of some of the children, the change of staff member may also have affected progress.

Reading	Writing
12/15 (80%) made expected/good progress in reading	11/15 (73.3%) made expected/good progress in writing
1/15 (6.6%) made slightly less than expected progress	2/15 (13.3%) made slightly less than expected progress

2/15 (13.3%)made only one progress step	1/15 (6.6%)made only one progress step 1/15(6.6%) made no progress
---	---

Outcomes – at end of KS1

Reading	Writing
4/15 (26.6%)children met age-related expectations	3/15 (20%)children met age-related expectations

Y1

Number of Children on Intervention: 12– split between 2 Teaching Assistants – 4 children left the school during the year

Outcomes - Progress (Reading & writing) 3 points would be expected/good progress according to the school's tracking system. Anything above would be very good/outstanding progress

Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Reading score at end of year	Writing score at end of year	Progress in Reading	Progress in Writing	Comments
■	14	14	18	18	4	4	
■	16	16	17	17	1	1	Child on school's vulnerable children's list
■	15	16	17	17	2	1	Disparity between achievement on intervention and achievement in class.
■	14	14	17	17	3	3	
■	15	15	17	17	2	2	Disparity between achievement on intervention and achievement in class.
■	14	14	18	17	3	3	
■	14	14	17	17	3	3	
■	15	15	18	18	3	3	

Reading	Writing
5/8 (62.5%)children made expected/good progress in reading	5/8 (62.5%)children made expected/good progress in reading
2/8 (25%)children made slightly less than expected progress	1/8 (12.5%)children made slightly less than expected progress
1/8 (12.5%)children made only 1 step of progress	1/8 (25%)children made only 1 step of progress

Reading	Writing
0/8 children met end-of-year age-related expectations	0/8 children met end-of-year age-related expectations

LCU - Literacy Catch Up – Wave 2 Reading & Writing Intervention

Description:

LCU is a wave 2 programme. The way we run the programme is very similar to that of FFT but there are fewer sessions a week and with small groups of children – typically 2-3 rather than 1:1.

Y2

Number of Children on Intervention: 14

One child left the school mid-year

4 children who were making outstanding progress on FFT were moved to LCU in January

Outcomes - Progress (Reading & writing) 3 points would be expected/good progress according to the school's tracking system. Anything above would be very good/outstanding progress

Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Reading score at end of year	Writing score at end of year	Progress in Reading	Progress in Writing	Comments
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	19	22	22	4	3	
■	18	18	20	20	2	2	Missed significant time in school due to medical issues mid-year – attendance was consequently low
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	
■	18	18	21	21	3	3	On school's vulnerable children's list
■	17	18	22	22	5	4	Moved to programme from FFT in Jan
■	17	17	22	22	5	5	Moved to programme from FFT in Jan
■	17	17	22	22	5	5	Moved to programme from FFT in Jan
■	18	18	22	22	4	4	Moved to programme from FFT in Jan

Outcomes - Progress (Reading)

All children made good or outstanding progress except for one who missed almost a quarter of the school year due to having to recover from a medical procedure.

Outcomes - Progress (Writing)

All children made good or outstanding progress except for one who missed almost a quarter of the school year due to having to recover from a medical procedure.

Outcomes – results at end of KS1

<u>Reading</u>	<u>Writing</u>
11/13 met age-related expectations	11/13 met age-related expectations

Y1

Number of Children on Intervention: 11 (1 child left the school mid-year; 1 was transferred to FFT due to limited progress)

Outcomes - Progress (Reading)

Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Reading score at end of year	Writing score at end of year	Progress in Reading	Progress in Writing	Comments
■	15	14	18	17	3	3	On the school's vulnerable children's list

■	14	14	17	17	3	3	
■	14	14	18	17	4	3	
■	14	14	17	17	3	3	
■	16	16	18	18	2	2	On a Child-in-Need (CIN) plan
■	15	15	17	17	2	2	On SEN register – Social communications issues.
■	16	16	17	18	1	2	
■	16	16	18	18	2	2	On the school's vulnerable children's list
■	16	14	18	17	2	3	

Outcomes - Progress (Reading)

4/9 (44.4%) children made expected/good progress; 4/9 (44.4%) made slightly less-than expected progress

1/9 (11.1%) made only one step progress

Outcomes - Progress (Writing)

5/9 (55.6%) children made expected/good progress; 4/9 (44.4%) children made slightly less-than expected progress

Reading	Writing
0 children met end of year expectations in reading	0 children met end of year expectations in writing

MCU – Maths Catch-Up – Maths Wave 2 Intervention

Description:

MCU is a wave 2 intervention programme taught in small groups – usually between 2-4 children.

Y2

Number of Children on Intervention: 17 – split between 3 Teaching Assistants

Child	Maths score at start of year	Maths score at end of year	Progress in Maths	Comments
■	19	22	3	
■	16	19	3	
■	17	20	3	
■	18	22	4	
■	19	22	3	
■	18	21	3	
■	17	19	2	Diagnosed with medical issue mid-year; missed school; parental unwillingness to allow referral to other agencies - EP & paediatrician. Had done the programme in Y1 and had made good progress
■	18	19	1	
■	18	22	4	
■	18	20	2	Attendance only 76% due to medical issue mid-year
■	17	19	2	On school's vulnerable children's list
■	18	19	1	
■	18	22	4	On school's vulnerable children's list
■	17	20	3	
■	18	22	4	
■	16	20	4	
■	No data	22		Child arrived mid-year with no data from start of academic year

11/17 made good/outstanding progress

3/17 children made slightly less than expected progress

2/17 made only one step's progress

There was no initial data for one child who came mid-year
Outcomes – results at end of KS1

Maths

7/17 met age-related expectations

Y1

Child	Maths score at start of year	Maths score at end of year	Progress in Maths	Comments
█	14	16	2	
█	13	16	3	
█	14	17	3	
█	14	16	2	
█	14	16	2	
█	15	17	2	
█	14	17	3	
█	15	18	3	
█	15	17	2	
█	15	17	2	
█	15	17	2	
█	14	18	4	
█	14	17	3	

9/13 (69.2%) children made good or better progress.

Outcomes – results at end of Y1

Maths

0/13 met age-related expectations for the end of year 1

Arrangements for Identification & Assessment of SEND pupils

SEND children were identified via several methods. Firstly, children receiving support from outside agencies such as Speech and Language Therapy (SALT); Occupational Therapy (OT); Children’s and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS); Children’s Sensory Team (CST) and children requiring support from the Educational Psychologist (EP) were automatically included.

Children that received the most intensive Reading and Writing intervention, Fischer Family Trust (FFT), were also considered by the school to be receiving something substantially ‘*in addition to and different from*’ – compared to the majority of children – to be included on the register. In Y2, 15 children received the intervention from the beginning of the year and therefore all were designated as SEND. Six were known (or became known during the year) to outside agencies. 2 other children were being supported by other agencies – Children’s Services, indicating support required at home (for parenting capacity, behavior or other issues). This is a decision which will be reviewed annually.

Children were identified mid-year through a graduated response. The children were identified by members of staff and meetings were held with parents regarding removing barriers to learning. Following a short monitoring period, children were either referred to other agencies, had their amount of support or intervention amended or staff continued to be monitor.

Update on SEND Provision Arrangements (Curriculum and interventions)

Reading Wise

The school did not continue with Reading Wise – an on-line computer-based programme which did not appear to boost our children’s progress and there were significant cost implications, too.

Numicon

The Inclusion Manager and a member of support staff attended training on delivery of a Numicon Intervention. Unfortunately, due to the timing of the training sessions (5 spaced throughout the year) teaching of groups could not be started until Easter time. At this point, the trained member of staff was ill for a significant period of time. It was therefore impossible to appropriately judge the progress of the children or the intervention.

SEND Budget allocation for past 12 months

High needs block (SEN funding) - £14,995 <There is no precise definition of a high needs pupil or a high needs student, but by this is meant those pupils or students who require provision that would not normally be available in mainstream settings within the delegated resources of a mainstream school, and who would require additional targeted resources in order to meet their needs in a mainstream setting, or placement in a specialist setting>

Schools receive 2 lots of funding of £6,000 each to support children whose needs are great and who the school believes may require EHCP/statements - £12,000 in total.

Adjustments are made to this funding in the budget for the following year where the number of children requiring this aid is more than the allocation and the school is therefore spending from its delegated budget to support more children than the funding would allow for.

Significant outlay:

Pupil premium money has been used to pay for Play-based Therapy - £6,156

£51,936 was used to employ staff running interventions supporting maths, English and children with English as an Additional Language

SEND Staffing Resources

- Staff illness may well have impacted on results. 1 staff member whose roll is to provide interventions throughout the day was ill for a significant period of time, meaning the children she was providing support for had to be shared around other members of staff
- Another member of staff who provided support in class in the mornings and ran interventions in the afternoon was absent following a procedure for the majority of the year
- Another teaching assistant – who provides a lot of intervention support in the afternoons had to have more time than was expected off school following complications with a procedure.

Complaints relating to SEND in past 12 months

*There have been **no complaints relating to SEND in the last 12 months.***

SEND School CPD arrangements in past 12 months

- *Training in different methods of differentiation jointly delivered by Inclusion Manger and SALT 21/3/16. Differentiation is now an item on the Staff Briefing weekly meeting agenda to allow staff to share what aspects of differentiation they have been using. We will continue to look at differentiation next academic year.*
- *Training on Social, Emotional and Mental Health was delivered by the Inclusion Manager to teaching and support staff on 18.1.16*

SEND Parent Partnership activities in past 12 months

Seminar Lessons - half-termly parent seminar lessons are facilitated for parents in all year groups which support them in developing an understanding of how the curriculum is taught to their children within their current year group but also in the next year group, prior to transfer. Parent feedback has been positive and sessions are always well-attended.

Reading Club - the school hosts a Year 1 after-school reading club in which pupils are targeted who require

support to improve their reading skills in-line with age-appropriate expectations. Parents attend these after school sessions which last for 30 minutes once a week and are given homework relating to the week’s input. We remove all barriers to attendance, encouraging parents to bring along other siblings. This has had a positive outcome on the attainment of the pupils by the end of KS 1. The course has run for several years and parents have provided glowing feedback.

‘School Start’ course run as a pilot scheme for LEA – (9 weeks) - aim was to improve parental knowledge re their children’s education; to aid the learners’ children integration into the education system; improve parental communication and literacy skills; make children and parents more confident learners; provide ESOL support. **Outcomes:** 14 parent from 4 different ethnic backgrounds attended. The majority of learners made good progress with speaking, listening, reading and writing skills. Most parents felt better able to support their children. Parents stated that they believe the children now perform better in class.

Closing the Gap Groups - targeted support for families whose children’s attainment requires improvement.

Y2 families - 5 families attended. 8 families attended; one family left the school and 2 other families had limited attendance due to their children’s health.

Outcomes: all children made progress in terms of common exception words they learned to sight read over the course of the sessions – with, on average an increase of 24 words per child. All parents fed back that the course had been useful and all were able to list examples of new learning.

Y1 families – 11 families attended the course at the start. 5 families attended more than half of the sessions. Sibling illness was often an issue resulting in non-attendance.

Outcomes: All of the parents completing the course felt it had been useful and were effusive in their praise.

Literacy & Maths open weeks – seminar lessons for parents to come and observe the sessions in their child’s class

Family Learning – run in partnership with the Local Authority, the course seeks to provide a high-quality learning programme for adults and families. The aim is to increase and widen participation in learning, promote the wider benefits of learning, enable people to develop skills, knowledge and confidence, and encourage a culture of life-long learning through progressing learners to further study.

Impact of partnerships with external agencies and other schools to improve quality of SEND provision in past 12 months

- The Inclusion Manager has shared support materials devised with the new changes to the Code of Practice to other schools via the SENDCo forum
- The Inclusion Manager has shared materials for the phonics intervention booster the school uses with another school in Harrow and made a presentation on the booster group in Summer term 2016
- We continue to work closely with external agencies including Speech and Language Therapy; Educational Psychology Service; Children’s Sensory Team; Occupational Therapy; Early Intervention Team

Further Information

Phonics Screening Check Intervention

The school again ran the Phonics Screening Check that we have devised to support children in meeting the demands of the assessment. The support is short term – 3 weeks prior to the check.

	Y1 Cumulative						Y2 Cumulative			
	2014		2015		2016		2015		2016	
			School	Nationa l	School	Nationa l	School	Nationa l	Scho ol	Nat
All pupils	87	74	82	77	70	81	99	90	97	91
Boys	85	70	70	73	62	77	100	88	96	89
Girls	89	78	93	81	77	84	98	92	98	93
Disadvant aged	88	63	80	66	80	70	94	84	95	86
Other	77	73	87	78	68	83	100	92	97	93

For a more detailed review of the Phonics Screening Check, please see Inclusion Manager for the separate report.

Play-based Therapy



4 children received support for between one hour -45 minutes per week. As previously noted, impact is very difficult to judge – children’s behavior may get worse before it gets better due to the nature of some of the concerns and challenges facing the children. However, the Inclusion Manager, in conference with the Head Teacher, felt that the school was not seeing enough improvement over a significant period of time to warrant the outlay of £6,000 per annum. The school therefore discontinued the service at the end of February. Attempts to use the Forest School as an alternative provision were thwarted due to the leader of Forest School being off on long-term illness.

Priorities for improvement of the school’s SEN provision for the next 12 months

Key priorities for improvement for the next 12 months

- *Continue to identify children who can be supported to make progress in-line with age-related expectations (ARE)*
- *Continue to regularly track support and input to measure impact and collate evidence to support future requests for EHCP*
- *Review and develop an action plan following the school’s second year with accreditation as a Centre of Excellence (Inclusion Quality Mark).*
- *Ensure all TAs leading interventions have a knowledge and understanding of how to track progress in-line with assessment without levels*
- *Audit phonics to ensure that systems in school are robust and that the school achieves in line or above national averages at the Phonics Screening Check*
- *Continue to explore whole-class teaching/quality first teaching of SEND pupils*