



**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)**

**2016-2017**

**Name of School: Kenmore Park Infant & Nursery School      Inclusion Manager: J Snowden**  
**Date of report: January 2018      SEN Governor: Rimple Goel**

Overall judgment 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. The children who did not make progress received EHCP plans, submitted by the school. Their award and the children acquiring spaces in special schools suggests that their depth of need was beyond the school’s scope to address.*

- **Quality of Teaching & Learning for SEND pupils**

*Evidence demonstrates that the interventions we run have a positive impact. Observations of support staff have shown some excellent practice. Whole-class teaching is carefully differentiated – and this will continue to be an area of focus for the school.*

- **Standard of behavior of SEND pupils**

*Behaviour figures were much better 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 very good.*

- **Quality of Leadership & Management of SEND provision**

*SEND 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 3<sup>rd</sup> year running in 2017.*

*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’	Number being Monitored /in receipt of Internal Intervention	Number of children who were in receipt of SALT	(Main) Area of Need (Chn on ‘SEN Support/EHCP)			
					Communi- cation & Interacti- on	Sensory &/or Physical Needs	Cogniti- on & Learnin- g	Social, Emotion al & Mental health
Nursery		2			2			
Reception	5	6	5	11	16		1	
Y1	0	18	22	7	7	1	9	1
Y2	1	24	21	4	4	2	18	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>

*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 =56 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 (supported by Jan Martin, SEN Consultant) to count children in receipt of FFT (Fischer Family Trust), our most intensive Literacy Intervention, as SEN (based on the definition of SEN as children receiving something **different from and in addition to...**)

**Communication and Interaction** remains a significant area of need. The number of children requiring Speech and Language Therapist input is consistently around the 20 mark although this changes as children move on and off the Therapist's caseload. This year, 28 children in total received support from the SALT. The needs in the school were considered sufficient to warrant the placement of an additional Speech & Language Therapist to come into school in addition to our attached-SALT's hours.

Governors should be made aware that as a service the Speech and Language Therapy (SALT) Team in Harrow continues to experience greater-than-ever levels of demand. Consequently, children whose level of need – identified in their initial SALT assessment – suggest they require X number of sessions per term - are not receiving their full entitlement. Children who join the school in Reception have their sessions protected as do the children who are on the Autism pathway.

It is also worth noting that the threshold for receiving SALT has risen over the last 2 years. Only those children whose needs are more severe (i.e. require frequent, specialist input) qualify for SALT. Children who are designated during assessment 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) do not meet the current high threshold for Speech and Language Therapy.

A huge challenge in 2016-2017 was the number of children joining the school with very severe levels of SEN. **5 children joined Reception requiring 1:1 support.** This was an unusual situation owing to several circumstances:

- The Local Authority had not employed an Educational Psychologist to be accessible to PVI nursery settings. In addition, the NHS had not been able to recruit a replacement early years Speech and Language Therapist, resulting in nurseries not being able to obtain advice from specialists and consequently were not in a position to make referrals.
- It was also noted during visits to PVI settings that staff were unsure how to prepare adequate requests for EHCPs and were submitting paperwork of a poor standard. Therefore they consequently stood very little chance of successfully gaining required funding. Kenmore Park Infant and Nursery School, working in partnership with the Early Years Strategy Team, put training in place PVI settings which was very well received in summer term 2017.

Only one of the five children who joined Reception had had an Education Health and Care Plan request submitted (which was agreed to mid-year) prior to joining the school. **The school successfully applied for 4 education health and care plans for the children.**

The school supported the parents of the children in their choosing of appropriate, other provision by:

- Arranging meetings between the parents and professionals working at schools with ASD units/special schools
- Supporting parents to visit the settings
- Sending Teaching Assistants who worked with the children/who shared a language with the parents to accompany parents on visits to the settings

As a result, **all 5 children secured places in settings better able to support their needs.** This included: 4 children attending special schools and 1 child attending a school with an attached ASD unit.

Parents of one child, who had secured a space at a special school, declined the place and exercised their parental right to choose the educational setting. They believed it was in their child's best interest to continue attending KPINS and transition to Year 1.

**Progress of Children on the SEN register in receipt of support from external agencies (Speech and Language Therapy, Children’s Sensory Team, etc.)**

*The school uses its own tracking system. Expected progress is judged to be 3 points/year. Therefore a child moving from a reading, writing or maths score of 16-19 would be judged to have made expected progress. Anything above this can be deemed good/outstanding.*

Y2											
	Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Maths score at start of year	Reading score at end	Writing score at end	Maths score at end	R progress	W progress	M progress	Comments
Children in receipt of EHCP		17	17	17	22	19	21	5	2	4	Actively avoided writing
Children in receipt of SALT		14	14	14	20	20	22	6	6	8	On school's vulnerable children list
		16	16	16	20	19	18	4	3	2	On school's vulnerable children list
		17	17	18	21	20	22	4	3	4	Diagnoses of ASD
Children in receipt of Children's Sensory Team support		18	18	18	22	22	22	4	4	4	
		18	17	18	22	22	21	4	5	3	On school's vulnerable children list
Y1											
	Child	Reading score at start of year	Writing score at start of year	Maths score at start of year	Reading score at end	Writing score at end	Maths score at end	R progress	W progress	M progress	Comments
Children in receipt of SALT		14	14	14	17	18	18	3	4	4	
		12	13	13	17	17	18	5	4	5	On school's vulnerable children list
		15	15	15	20	19	19	5	4	4	
		13	14	14	18	18	18	5	4	4	
		11	12	13	12	12	10	1	0	-3	EHCP application will be made
		14	13	14	16	16	16	2	3	2	EHCP application has been submitted
		15	15	15	18	18	18	3	3	3	



<i>Children with Hearing Impairment</i>		15	15	15	19	19	19	4	4	4	
<i>Children with Social, Emotional and Mental Health issues</i>		15	15	14	17	18	17	2	3	3	<i>On school's vulnerable children list</i>

<b>Reception</b>									
<p><b>Progress of Children on the SEN register in receipt of support from external agencies (Speech and Language Therapy, Children’s Sensory Team, ASD advisory teacher, etc.)</b></p> <p><b>The school uses its own tracking system. Expected progress is judged to be 3 points/year for children whose on entry data is in line with age related expectations. Anything above this can be deemed good/outstanding.</b></p>									
<b>Maths</b>									
Name	Numbers baseline	Numbers, Spring 2	MAT Numbers School Assessment	Progress in Numbers	Shape Space & Meas- HC Rec Baseline-1	SSM Spring 2	SSM School Assessment	Progress in Shape Space and Measure	Comments
	8-20s	30-50s	1	6+	16-26s	30-50d	1	5+	
	22-36e	30-50d	1	4+	22-36e	30-50d	1	4+	
	8-20s	30-50e	1	7+	16-26s	22-36d	1	2+	ASD; received EHCP while at school; secured a place in a special school
	22-36e	22-36s	1	2+	22-36e	22-36e	1	0	School obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school
	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36e	30-50s	1	5+	
	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36e	22-36e	1	0	School obtained EHCP
	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	
	22-36e	40-60e	2	8+	22-36e	40-60e	2	8+	
	22-36e	22-36d	1	2+	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	
	22-36e	30-50d	1	4+	16-26d	22-36e	1	2+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a school with an ASD provision
	30-50s	40-60d	2	3+	30-50e	40-60e	2	5+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school
<b>Outcomes: Progress in Maths</b>									
<b>Numbers</b>					<b>Shape, Space, Measure</b>				
5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 4/11 (36.4%) made expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made less than expected progress					5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 2/11 (18.2%) made expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made less than expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made no progress				
<b>Outcomes: Attainment in Maths</b>									
<b>Numbers</b>					<b>Shape, Space, Measure</b>				
2/11 (18.2%) met age-related expectations 9/11 (81.8%) did not meet age-related expectation					2/11 (18.2%) met age-related expectations in SSM 9/11 (81.8%) did not meet age-related expectation				
<b>Literacy</b>									

Name	Reading baseline	Reading Spring 2	Reading School Assessment	Progress in Reading	Writing baseline	Writing Spr 2	Writing School Assessment	Progress in Reading	Comments
	16-26s	30-50d	1	5+	22-36e	40-60e	1	6+	
	16-26d	30-50s	2	10+	22-36e	30-50s	1	5+	
	8-20s	22-36s	1	3+	16-26e	30-50d	1	4+	ASD; received EHCP while at school; secured a place in a special school
	8-20s	22-36d	1	4+	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	School obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school
	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36e	30-50d	1	4+	
	8-20s	22-36e	1	4+	16-26d	22-36d	1	3+	School obtained EHCP
	22-36d	30-50e	1	2+	22-36d	30-50d	1	3+	Suffers from selective mutism
	22-36e	30-50s	2	8+	22-36e	30-50s	1	5+	
	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36s	30-50s	1	3+	
	22-36e	22-36s	1	2+	22-36s	30-50e	1	1+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a school with an ASD provision
	22-36e	22-36s	2	8+	30-50e	30-50d	2	5+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school

**Outcomes: Progress in Literacy**

Reading	Writing
6/11 (54.5%) made good or better progress 3/11 (27.3%) made expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made less than expected progress	6/11 (54.5%) made good or better progress 4/11 (36.4%) made expected progress 1/11 (9%) made less than expected progress

**Outcomes: Attainment in Literacy**

Reading	Writing
3/11 (27.3%) met age-related expectations 8/11 (72.7%) did not meet age-related expectation	1/11 (9%) met age-related expectations 10/11 (90.9%) did not meet age-related expectation

**Physical Development**

Name	Moving and Handling baseline	Moving & Handling Spring 2	Moving & Handling School Assessment	Progress in Moving and Handling	Health and Self-care baseline	Health and Self-care Spr 2	Health and Self-care School Assessment	Progress in Health and Self-care	Comments
	22-36d	30-50d	1	3+	22-36d	40-60e	2	7+	Significant involvement from OT
	30-50d	40-60d	2	5+	30-50d	40-60e	2	4+	
	22-36d	30-50s	2	7+	22-36d	30-50s	2	7+	ASD; received EHCP while at school; secured a place in a special school
	22-36s	40-60e	1	4+	22-36s	30-50s	1	3+	School obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school

	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	22-36s	30-50s	1	3+	
	22-36e	22-36s	1	2+	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+	School obtained EHCP
	22-36s	30-50e	1	1+	30-50d	30-50s	1	1+	Frequently refused to participate in lessons
	22-36d	30-50s	2	7+	22-36e	30-50d	2	8+	
	30-50e	40-60e	2	5+	30-50e	40-60e	1	3+	
	30-50e	30-50s	1	2+	30-50e	30-50s	1	2+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a school with an ASD provision
	30-50d	40-60e	2	2+	30-50d	40-60e	1	2+	ASD - school obtained EHCP; secured a space in a special school

**Outcomes: Progress in Physical Development**

Moving & Handling	Health & Self-Care
<p>5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 2/11 (18.2%) made expected progress 3/11 (27.3%) made less than expected progress 1/11 (9%) made significantly less than expected progress</p>	<p>5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 4/11 (36.4%) made expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made less than expected progress 1/11 (9%) made significantly less than expected progress</p>

**Outcomes: Physical Development Attainment**

Moving & Handling	Health & Self-Care
<p>5/11 (45.5%) met age-related expectations in numbers 6/11 (54.5%) did not meet age-related expectation</p>	<p>4/11 (36.4%) met age-related expectations in SSM 7/11 (63.6%) did not meet age-related expectation</p>

**PSE**

Name	Making Relations hips baseline	Making Relations hips Spring 2	Making Relations hips School Assessment	Progress in Making Relations hips	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness baseline	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness Spring 2	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness School Assessment	Progress in Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness	Managing Feelings & Behaviour baseline	Managing Feelings & Behaviour Spring 2	Managing Feelings & Behaviour School Assessment	Progress in Managing Feelings & Behaviour
	22-36e	30-50s	2	8+	22-36d	30-50s	1	4+	22-36e	30-50d	2	8+
	30-50d	40-60e	2	4+	30-50e	30-50s	2	5+	22-36s	30-50s	2	6+
	16-26s	22-36s	1	3+	22-36d	30-50d	1	3+	16-26d	22-36s	1	4+
	22-36s	30-50e	1	1+	22-36d	30-50e	1	2+	22-36d	22-36s	1	1+
	16-26e	30-50e	1	6+	16-26e	30-50e	1	6+	22-36s	30-50e	1	1+
	8-20s	22-36e	1	4+	22-36e	22-36s	1	2+	16-26e	22-36d	1	4+
	22-36d	30-50e	1	2+	22-36d	30-50e	1	2+	22-36d	30-50e	1	2+
	22-36d	30-50s	1	4+	30-50e	40-60e	2	5+	30-50e	40-60e	1	5+



	22-36e	30-50e	2	8+	30-50e	30-50d	1	2+	22-36s	30-50s	1	3+
	16-26d	22-36d	1	3+	16-26s	30-50e	1	4+	16-26e	22-36e	1	3+
	22-36e	22-36s	1	2+	22-36s	30-50d	1	2+	22-36e	30-50e	1	3+

**Outcomes in PSE: Progress**

Making Relationships	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness	Managing Feelings & Behaviour
6/11 (54.5%) made good or better progress 2/11 (18.2%) made expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made less than expected progress 1/11 (9%) made significantly less than expected progress	5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 1/11 (9%) made expected progress 5/11 made less than expected progress	5/11 (45.5%) made good or better progress 3/11 (27.3%) made expected progress 1/11 (9%) made less than expected progress 2/11 (18.2%) made significantly less than expected progress

**Outcomes in PSE: Attainment**

Making Relationships	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness	Managing Feelings & Behaviour
3/11 (27.3%) met age-related expectations in numbers 8/11 (72.7%) did not meet age-related expectation	2/11 (18.2%) met age-related expectations in numbers 9/11 (90.9%) did not meet age-related expectation	2/11 (18.2%) met age-related expectations in numbers 9/11 (90.9%) did not meet age-related expectation

**Conclusions**

- In almost all areas, the majority of children made good/better progress – though did not necessarily make enough progress to meet age-related expectations by the end of the year.
- The areas in which more children made less-than-expected progress tended to be areas in which their areas of need presented difficulties. The high number of children with ASD in the cohort accounted for some of this: ‘...recent studies show that movement difficulties are very common in children on the autistic spectrum, and importantly, poor motor skills are associated with; greater difficulties with social communication.’ <http://www.skillsforaction.com/autism-spectrum-disorders>

**Nursery**

**Progress of Children on the SEN register in receipt of support from external agencies (Speech and Language Therapy, Children’s Sensory Team, ASD advisory teacher, etc.)**

The school uses its own tracking system. Expected progress is judged to be 3 points/year. Anything above this can be deemed good/outstanding.

**Personal, Social & Emotional Development (PSE)**

Name	Making Relationships Nursery Baseline	Making Relationships Nursery Summer 2	Progress	Self-Confidence and Self-Awareness Nursery Baseline	Self-Confidence and Self-Awareness Nursery Baseline	Progress	Managing Feelings and Behaviour Nursery Baseline	Managing Feelings and Behaviour	Progress
	16-26d	30-50s	7	22-36e	30-50s	5	16-26e	30-50s	8
	8-20d	22-36d	6	16-26e	30-50e	6	8-20e	30-50e	9

**Outcomes in PSE: Progress**

Making Relationships	Self-Confidence & Self-Awareness	Managing Feelings & Behaviour
2/2 made good or better progress	2/2 made good or better progress	2/2 made good or better progress



Outcomes in PSE: Progress									
0/2 met age-related expectations			0/2 met age-related expectations			0/2 met age-related expectations			
Communication & Language (C&L)									
Name	Listening & Attention Nursery Baseline	Listening & Attention Nursery Summer 2	Progress	Understanding Nursery Baseline	Understanding Nursery Summer 2	Progress	Speaking Nursery Baseline	Speaking Nursery Summer 2	Proress
	22-36e	30-50e	3	16-26d	30-50d	6	16-26d	30-50e	5
	8-20e	22-36d	4	8-20d	22-36d	6	8-20d	22-36d	6
Outcomes in Communication & Language: Progress									
Listening & Attention			Understanding			Speaking			
1/2 made good or better progress 1/2 made expected progress			2/2 made good or better progress			2/2 made good or better progress			
Outcomes in C&L: Attainment									
Listening & Attention			Understanding			Speaking			
0/2 met age-related expectations			0/2 met age-related expectations			0/2 met age-related expectations			
Physical Development (PD)									
Name	Moving and Handling Nursery Baseline	Moving and Handling Nursery Summer 2	Progress	Health and Self-care Nursery Baseline	Understanding Nursery Summer 2	Progress			
	22-36e	30-50d	4	22-36e	30-50s	5			
	16-26d	30-50e	5	16-26e	30-50e	6			
Outcomes in Physical Development: Progress									
Moving and Handling					Health and Self-care				
2/2 made good or better progress					2/2 made good or better progress				
Outcomes in Physical Development: Attainment									
0/2 met age-related expectations					0/2 met age-related expectations				

## Interventions

FFT – Fischer Family Trust – Wave 3 Reading & Writing Intervention
<p><b>Description:</b> FFT is a wave 3 programme taught 1:1. Children receive 4x20min sessions a week</p> <p><b>Y2</b> Number of Children on Intervention: 17 children – split between 4 Teaching Assistants. Due to a change in one member of staff's working hours – who reduced their working hours partway through due to health issues – fewer children were able to have access to the FFT programme – 19 as opposed to 21 last year.</p> <p>One child began the programme but it was decided his level of learning made inclusion on the programme impossible. His basic skills in reading were insufficient and instead he received 1:1 daily support using precision teaching methods.</p> <p>The intervention runs from October – June. The majority of children remain on the programme for the full year, though half-termly reviews are made to ensure the correct children are receiving the programme.</p> <p><b>Outcomes - Progress (Reading &amp; writing) 3 points would be expected progress according to the school's tracking system. Anything above would be good/outstanding progress</b></p>

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
	16	16	21	22	5	6	
	15	15	22	22	7	7	
	16	17	20	22	4	5	
	17	18	21	22	4	4	
	16	16	20	19	4	3	On school's vulnerable children's list
	16	17	20	22	4	5	
	14	N/A	19	18	5	N/A	New arrival into school in June in Y1. Unable to give a baseline for writing. Began FFT in February 2017
	16	17	21	21	6	4	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	Removed from the programme in Feb following excellent progress
	17	17	22	22	5	5	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	Removed from the programme in Feb following excellent progress
	18	18	22	22	5	5	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	
	16	16	21	22	5	6	
	17	16	20	21	3	5	
	17	18	20	21	3	3	
	16	17	21	22	5	5	

Reading	Writing
19/19 (100%) made expected or better progress in reading	19/19 (100%) made expected or better progress in writing

**Outcomes – at end of KS1**

Reading	Writing
8/19 children (42.1%) met age-related expectations (as opposed to 4/15 or 26.6% last year)	14/19 children (73.6%) met age-related expectations (as opposed to 3/15 or 20% children last year)

**Y1**

Number of Children on Intervention: 11– split between 2 Teaching Assistants

**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	13	18	18	4	5	

	13	14	18	18	5	4	
	15	15	18	18	3	3	
	14	14	18	18	4	4	VC list: CP plan
	15	15	18	18	3	3	
	15	14	18	18	3	4	
	15	14	18	18	3	4	VC list: parenting capacity
	14	15	18	17	4	2	
	15	15	18	18	3	3	VC list: parenting capacity
	15	15	18	17	3	2	VC list: DV
	14	13	18	19	4	5	

<b>Reading</b> 11/11 children (100%) made expected/good progress in reading as opposed to 5/8 or (62.5%) last year  2/8 (25%) children made less than expected progress  1/8 (12.5%) children made only 1 step of progress	<b>Writing</b> 8/11 children (72.7%) made expected/good progress in writing as opposed to 5/8 (62.5%) children last year  2/11 children (18.1%) made less than expected progress in writing as opposed to 2/8 (25%) last year
---	--

<b>Reading</b> 0/11 children met end-of-year age-related expectations by the end of the year - the same number that had met age-related scores last year	<b>Writing</b> 1/11 children met end-of-year age-related expectations by the end of the year – one more than last year
---	---

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

**Description:**  
LCU is a wave 2 programme. It is facilitated in a similar way to the FFT programme but there are fewer sessions a week and the organization of teaching groups is different.

Due to a change in one member of staff's working hours – who reduced their working hours partway through due to health issues – fewer children were able to have access to the programme - **only 4 children took part** as opposed to 14 last 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
	17	18	23	22	6	4	
	17	17	22	22	5	5	On the school's vulnerable children's list due to parental capacity
	16	17	22	22	6	5	
	17	18	21	21	4	3	

**Outcomes - Progress (Reading)**  
All of the children made good or outstanding progress.

**Outcomes - Progress (Writing)**

3/4 children made good or outstanding progress. One made the expected progress.

**Outcomes – results at end of KS1**

<u>Reading</u>	<u>Writing</u>
<p><b>1 child exceeded age-related expectations, gaining ‘mastery’ at reading (and effectively making 2 years progress in one year.)</b></p> <p><b>2 children were ‘at-age-related expectations in reading (again one made 2 years of progress in one year)</b></p> <p><b>1 child did not meet ‘age-related expectation’ but was adjudged to be ‘working towards.’</b></p>	<p><b>3 children met age-related expectations in reading</b></p> <p><b>1 child did not meet ‘age-related expectation’ but was adjudged to be ‘working towards.’</b></p>

**Y1**

Number of Children on Intervention: 8

**(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
	12	13	19	18	7	5	
	15	15	18	18	3	3	Put on a CIN plan during the year
	15	15	18	18	3	3	On the school's vulnerable children's list due to parental capacity; on the SALT caseload
	15	15	19	18	4	3	
	15	15	18	18	3	3	
	15	14	18	17	3	3	
	15	14	18	18	3	4	On the school's vulnerable children's list due to parental capacity
	15	15	18	18	3	3	

**Outcomes - Progress (Reading)**

8/8 (100%) of children made expected/good progress compared with 44.4% (4/9 last year)

**Outcomes - Progress (Writing)**

8/8 (100%) of children made expected/good progress compared with 55.6% (5/9 last year)

<u>Reading</u>	<u>Writing</u>
2/8 children met end of year expectations in reading compared to 0 children last year	0/8 children met end of year expectations in writing compared with 0 children last year.

**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: 21– split between 3 Teaching Assistants

Child	Maths score at start of year	Maths score at end of year	Progress in Maths	Comments
	18	22	4	

	16	21	5	
	17	22	5	
	16	22	6	
	14	22	8	
	17	22	5	
	17	22	5	
	17	22	5	
	17	21	4	
	16	20	4	
	18	22	4	
	18	22	4	
	17	23	5	
	17	20	3	
	16	22	6	
	17	21	4	
	17	21	4	
	15	20	5	
		18	N/A	Child entered Y2 with no score noted at end of Y1 – child was a new arrival with little English. His progress was immense.
	17	22	5	
	18	22	4	

21/21 made good/outstanding progress  
2 children made 2 or more years progress in the year.  
Outcomes – results at end of KS1

**Maths Catch Up Y2**

**12/21 met age-related expectations**

**1/21 achieved above age-related expectations**

**Y1**

Child	Maths score at start of year	Maths score at end of year	Progress in Maths	Comments
	14	18	4	
	15	18	3	
	15	18	3	
	14	18	4	

All children made expected/good progress

**Maths Catch Up Y1**

**0/4 met age-related expectations**

**Maths - Breaking Barriers**

Breaking Barriers is wave 2 or wave 3 programme. It is based around the Numicon maths programme. We trialed this with several children whose progress we had concerns about.

**Y1**

Child	Maths score at start of year	Maths score at end of year	Progress in Maths	Comments
	14	16	2	Application for EHCP has been submitted.
	13	17	4	
	15	17	2	New arrival with limited English
	14	16	2	New arrival with limited English

1/4 children made good/better progress

2/3 children made somewhat less than expected progress

Outcomes – results at end of Y1

**Maths Breaking Barriers**

0/4 met age-related expectations for the end of year 1 – though this was not expected

**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 – and were therefore included on the register. This arrangement was discussed and agreed by Jan Martin, a consultant who was employed by Harrow LA to support schools to implement changes following the introduction of the new SEN Code of Practice, 2014.

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 monitor progress over time.

**Update on SEND Provision Arrangements (Curriculum and interventions)**

**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 commence until Easter time. At which point, the trained member of staff became ill and was unable to deliver the programme. On return, a shorter intervention was devised using the ‘Breaking Barriers’ materials from Numicon. The results of that intervention are included in this report.

**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 it 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 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:**

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

*The needs of several children in reception meant that staffing costs for the year (to provide 1:1 support) were significantly above what was budgeted for.*

**SEND Staffing Resources**

- Staff illness and a lack of resources to cover programmes (which require staff running them to have received specialist training) will undoubtedly have impacted on results. 1 staff member whose role is to provide interventions throughout the day was ill for a significant period of time (30 working days), therefore the children she was providing support to had to be shared around other members of staff (which in turn resulted in some children receiving less intervention support.) Due to ongoing health issues, on return to work, the same member of staff requested to reduce her working hours which again impacted upon the number of children to whom the school was able to offer support.
- Given school budgets going forward, it may well be necessary to reduce the amount of money spent on staffing resources.

**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 regarding Neurodiversity (following Inclusion Manager receiving training on 12/10/17 by Patoss) was cascaded to staff on 16/01/2018. Resources included an assessment tool which staff have used to identify possible areas of need of children.*
- *Training was provided by the Children's Sensory Team on 25/05/17 regarding how to support children with glue ear in the classroom.*
- *An Advisory Teacher for Autistic Children, Jane Bevan-Cotton, was requested to observe an ASD child who was having particular behavioural difficulties and who may have faced exclusion. Suggestions were put in place by the Class Teacher, TA and Inclusion Manager, resulting in improved outcomes regarding behaviour.*

**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 and meet age-appropriate expectations. Parents attend these after school sessions which last for 30 minutes once a week and are given gap tasks relating to the week's input. We remove all barriers to improve 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.

**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 ran a course for PVI Nursery Settings to support their understanding of how to make effective submissions for Education Health and Care Plans. The course was given the highest possible rating in all areas by all attendees (from 5 nurseries). Further support was offered to the Nurseries and contact details of the Inclusion Manager have been shared in order to provide further advice and support.
- We continue to work closely with external agencies including Speech and Language Therapy; Educational Psychology Service; Children’s Sensory Team; Occupational Therapy; Home Start.

**Further Information**

**Phonics Screening Check Intervention**

Following the disappointing results from last year, the school focused more heavily on phonics. An action plan was devised by the Inclusion manager including actions such as: more intervention at an earlier stage; more detailed assessment of the children; children given additional practice in experiencing the assessment. Additionally, family learning groups were put in place in which parents learned phonics skills over a period of weeks and were involved in teaching and supporting their children with phonics skills. For a copy of the action plan, please see the Inclusion Manager.

**All scores are in percentages**

	Y1 Cumulative								**Y2 Cumulative					
	2014		2015		2016		2017		2015		2016		2017	
	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National
All pupils	87	74	82	77	70	81	87.6	81	99	90	97	91	85.7	92
Boys	85	70	70	73	62	77	80.8	78	100	88	96	89	71 (5/7)	90
Girls	89	78	93	81	77	84	93.4	85	98	92	98	93	85.7 (6/7)	94
Disadvantaged	88	63	80	66	80	70	85.7	68	94	84	95	86	100 1pupil	84
SEN							87.5	43					85.7	63

*\*\*as has previously been done by the SENDCo, data here is focused solely on the children who took the assessment in Y2. The national data is ambiguous here – does the figure relate to Y1 and Y2 children who have passed (e.g. % of all the children who have achieved the requisite score by end of Y2 (89.3%) – so including the children who passed in Y1) or solely the children who have taken/retaken the check in Y2?? Several phone calls to 2 government education departments yielded no satisfactory response.*

#### **Play-based Therapy**

It was not possible to provide play-based therapy for children this year. Social skills groups were run by the school's ELKLAN-trained teaching assistant. The school actively pursued alternative providers and are set to be involved with 2 organizations in 2017/18.

The school did organize for a child who was bereaved to receive bereavement support from Bereavement UK.

#### **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 third 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*
- *Continue to ensure that Phonics is taught accurately and well and that children achieve in-line with expectation in the PSC*
- *Investigate further Maths intervention programmes – although children made good progress in Maths Catch Up, the feeling is that the impact of this programme depends on heavily adapting it. We will explore possible other alternatives.*