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| **Summary of evidence.** |
| Discussion with SENCo  Discussions with 5 x assistant teachers  Part lesson observations, concentrating on provision and achievement of SEND children  Scrutiny of books  Reviews of IEPs and RAMPs.  Discussions with children  Review of tutor boxes |
| **Discussions with Mrs Rebecca Catteral.** |
| Rebecca has been in post as SENCo since September, having previously held other roles and responsibilities in school. Rebecca has 0.1 release time to undertake her role, as well as other times if possible. She described her weekly discussions with the headteacher about SEND provision within the school, and the progress children are making. We discussed the expertise and strength of SEND within the school, and the fact that the headteacher was very knowledgeable in this area. Both the headteacher and deputy have the SENCo award. Rebecca outlined the support the school receives from the Local Authority, from the Educational Psychologist and the Speech and Language team. The school is obviously making the most of external support. We discussed the SENCo award and when might be appropriate to start this: the school is indicating that this will be taken after an appropriate time undertaking the role first.They feel it would be beneficial to hold off and for Rebecca to do the new NPQ SEND.    Rebecca shared with me the SEND register. This was compiled in September and reviewed this month. We went through each child on the register (26), with Rebecca outlining the type of need and the provision provided. Rebecca has a good knowledge of each child and their needs. She described the meetings held with parents so that they were involved with their child’s education. We discussed the support and help from the LA in developing provision based on their professional observations. An example of this is the specialist advice a child receives in Y2, and the customised support which is provided. Another example is a child in Y5 who receives very detailed 1:1 support.  As with most schools, the profile of SEND varies in different year groups. Some year groups have a significant number of pupils with SEND (eg Y2 and Y5, approximately 20%+). Speech and language and SpLD appear to be very common. Tracking would suggest children make good progress at Longton.  The school aims to meet individual needs at the earliest opportunity, and discuss with parents the nature and type of support. Nursery visits and home visits are undertaken, so the school is fully aware of need prior to children starting at school. Individual Education Plans are written by the class teacher, and it is their duty to update these and amend them when targets have been met. The SENCo explained that these are reviewed by the class teacher and usually the Assistant Teacher on a termly basis, and sometimes more regularly. |
| **Review of IEPs.** |
| I read a number of IEPs from Y1 to Y6, as well as a few RAMPs.  Y6.  H. H has a RAMP, with specific actions highlighted to moderate and improve attitudes to learning. H. was able to talk about these strategies, and spoke they help him control his behaviour. He spoke of receiving less yellow cards this year, and few reds. He was positive about this.  T. T has an IEP for SEMH issues. This provides incremental targets and support on a termly basis. He was positive about the support he received and participated in the full curriculum.  All IEPs are reviewed by the class teacher in detail, with the use of a colour-coded system to indicate progress. Successes are highlighted, areas for further support identified. They include simple small steps linked to the targets.  Y5.  I reviewed several IEPs. I would suggest that the evaluations could be in greater depth, so that all know what are the successes, what are the barriers, using the colour-coded system in use elsewhere. In some instances the targets are exactly the same in Spring as in Autumn.  Y4. There was clear progression in the IEPs. Simple steps were used (eg high frequency words, ai oa phonics and digraphs, or use of capitals and full stops one term, followed by commas the next).  Y3.  I reviewed two IEPs. These are evaluated by yellow and green targets are linked (eg) to phonics, reading, visual attention and concentration. IEPs are evaluated termly. |
| **Classroom observations.** |
| 10.15: Y5. The lesson was based on fractions and all children accessed this. SEND were mainly at the same table, to the right of the IWB. Differentiation was provided by task (3 levels), with special provision by the AT for one Y5 boy. Teacher input was provided to lower ability children (including those with SEND) by the class teacher. Children were able, or beginning to, to work out simple fractions of number (eg 1/5 of 30, followed by 3/5 etc).  10.45: Y2 (led by TP student, under supervision of class teacher). SEND children have moved since my last visit, and are now located mainly to the rear of the class. Most of the children (including those with SEND) were involved in the main focus of the lesson (division TU by 3 or 5). Two SEND children were engaged with laptops on number bonds to 10. Differentiation was by task. Support was offered to children (including those with SEND children) by the teacher, AT and student during the independent activities. Children were beginning to identify simple division facts, and were beginning to write these in a sentence (eg 1/3 of 15, 15/3 = 5. 1/5 of 55, 55/5 = 11).  11.10: Y1 literacy. The majority of children, including those with SEND, were involved with the entirety of the lesson (in this case, simple instructions). One SEND child worked with the AT on specific aspects of his IEP (in this case, tracing letters in a rice tray, matching colours in pegs). The main part of the lesson involved all children. Differentiation was by outcome. Children were beginning to write simple instruction sentences. One child was able to draw the letter h, for the first time. Support was given by the teacher and AT to all children, although did understandably focus on a few identified children.  11.45: Y4 literacy. This lesson was well underway when I arrived. In a purposeful learning environment, two groups of children were doing a guided read. The AT worked with a group of 5 SEND children, on the same text as the whole class. Children were able to read the text, and discuss the use of vocabulary and the main events. During the I/A, one Y5 boy was able to explain the task, explain what a banshee was (the storm, the damage and the farmer sitting calmly in the kitchen). Another Y4 boy was able to describe the moods of the characters, by both explaining the events and predicting what might happen next. SEND achieved well.  1.05: Y3. A brief visit, sorry, time caught up with me. I discussed with the AT the various children with their IEPs and others who received support. |
| **Discussions with children.** |
| I met with some 10 children. Children brought along their tutor boxes and their books. Children were able to share the contents of their tutor boxes and how the resources were used to support their learning. These tutor boxes were all different, showing they were individualised according to need. For example, a child with spatial issues was able to talk about her reading book and how that helped. Another children spoke about riding a bicycle while another discussed building his core strength. Children did not feel isolated, left out or made to feel different because of their needs. All considered they were being helped. The vast majority felt supported at school. They talked about the subjects they enjoyed most, with writing being a common favourite. |
| **Brief scrutiny of work** |
| I reviewed a range of Y2 - Y6 books in both core and foundation subjects. My impression was the children with SEND have equal access to the full curriculum, in that interventions and 1:1 support does not appear to impinge on the entitlement of children to all national curriculum subjects. Y6 books for example showed extensive work in science, geography and history. Other books sampled similarly covered a range of subjects. Work was differentiated for the majority of the time. |
| **Assistant teachers** |
| I met with a group of five colleagues. The majority of colleagues have been employed at the school for a number of years. They felt well-supported by the school, and have been given many opportunities to undertake appropriate SEND training. They were able to describe their training, whether this be specific SEND training or whole-school activities (eg phonics) and also how it impacted on their work in school (eg individualised support for children with autism, use of play dough). They described their role in delivering the IEPs, showing examples of how the resources in the tutor boxes delivered the priorities in the IEP. They generally felt involved in the writing and review of these IEPs.  They are a knowledgeable and dedicated group of colleagues. |
| **Impact.** |
| IEPs: these are generally high quality, are consistent in style, content and production across the school. IEPs hold the essential information about the child, their strengths and identified needs. It outlines their academic achievement in the core subjects, usually by NC and /or PIVATs. The chronology over the years is helpful in showing where the child has come from. The evidence in most of the IEPs suggested children are involved in their production, to some extent. However, this was not evident in the conversations with children. The targets which we looked at are similar and consistent across the range of IEPS in nature. They have small steps, and develop across the two terms (autumn and spring). They are reviewed at least termly, sometimes more. Updates in Y6 for example are made in green or yellow, and dated. In the majority of cases, children have made progress in meeting the targets. Assistant Teachers know their IEPs well, and are able to show how they support their implementation with individual tutor boxes. ATs are able to describe how they support their children, different strategies for support. This was validated in lesson observations.  Classroom practice: with one exception, SEND children received the same curriculum as their peers.  Y1: majority of the class involved in introduction and teaching part of the lesson, N was engaged in his IEP work (letter recognition, pegs)  Y2: 2 children doing number bonds in laptops, other children involved with main input then individual work on division. Differentiation by ability.  Y3: all children involved in main topic: Chinese New Year  Y4: SEND group involved in guided read by themselves. All SEND children were then involved in independent activities on the same these (personification). O. was able to explain what a banshee was, and the context of the story. R. was able to describe the moods of the characters in the story.  The tracking system would suggest children make good progress across the school. |
| **Main Findings** |
| IEPs are individualised, and small termly steps help deliver the targets.  Children with SEND receive the full curriculum offer.  SEND children were enthusiastic about their learning.  Classroom observations would suggest SEND children are fully integrated with their peers.  The SENDCo knows her children well.  The ATs are well-trained and know their children well and are a passionate advocate for them  To explore further:-   * Review of IEPs: in all cases these are reviewed termly. In some cases, the review is more thorough and shows what children can do and what they need more help with. Some are colour-coded (green and yellow) to show successes and areas for development. Perhaps the school might consider having greater consistency in this. * Do the children get involved in their IEPs, either setting them or in their review. All IEPs are found easily in the tutor boxes, and are obviously read and used. Evaluations sometimes include a child input. However, in discussions with children (Y2 to Y6), some were (or seemed to be) unaware of the plan. |
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