

# Report to governors on SEND/EAL/PP March 2023

## 1. SCHOOL PROFILE

Current number of children on SEN Support and EHCPs = 73, 20%

From the total 73 children on SEN Support or EHCPs:

Compared to the percentage of pupils on SEN Support/EHCP in February 2022, this is an increase of 2.2% in a year.

	SEND SEN Support and EHCPs No. of pupils % of year & whole school %	EAL No. of pupils % of year & whole school %	Pupil Premium No. of pupils % of year & whole school %
Year 3	19/86 26% 5%	36/86 42% 10%	8/86 9% 2%
Year 4	18/91 25% 5%	32/91 35% 9%	12/91 13% 3%
Year 5	21/90 23% 6%	30/90 33% 8%	17/90 19% 5%
Year 6	16/89 18% 4%	19/89 21% 5%	10/89 11% 3%
Total	74/356 21%	117/356 33%	47/356 13%

EHCPs across the school:

Year group	No. of EHCP	No. of EHCNA
3	1	1
4	1	0
5	2	2
6	0	0
Total	4	3

## 1. SCHOOL PROFILE

--

COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION		COGNITION AND LEARNING		SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HEALTH DIFFICULTIES		SENSORY AND/OR PHYSICAL NEEDS	
No. of pupils with this need	No. of pupils with an EHC plan	No. of pupils with this need	No. of pupils with an EHC plan	No. of pupils with this need	No. of pupils with an EHC plan	No. of pupils with this need	No. of pupils with an EHC plan
15	2	42	0	15	2	2	0

## 2. IDENTIFYING PUPILS WITH SEND

If a parents is concerned that their child is presenting with difficulties in their learning, emotional needs or other SEN concerns, the first thing is for the parents to discuss with class teacher and share their concerns. From there they will have a discussion around whether the teachers are seeing similar concerns in class. The parents can then request a meeting with the SENDCo to share their concerns.

The SENDCo will then meet with the class teacher to find out how that child is presenting in class. Observations will be carried out by the SENDCo of the child in question. There may be a need for some assessments to be carried out by the SENDCo to ascertain whether the child is struggling with their learning, their emotional or mental health needs or anything else.

Once observations and assessments have been carried out the SENDCo will meet with the parents and teacher again to share their findings and a plan will be put in place. This plan may be to monitor the child for a few weeks to see if there is any improvement, it may be that the child needs to have an ILP in place and interventions to support with the learning. A referral may need to be made to an outside agency, Child Development Centre, Occupational Therapy, Speech and Language, etc.

The child will then be identified on Bromcom as SEN Support (K) and will be reviewed regularly with the class teacher and SENDCo to check progress is being made or not.

If it is clear after a term, that no or very little progress is being made, further investigations will be carried out into the child's needs. This may involve referring to other teams such as the Autism and Social Communication Team, Learning Behaviour Advisory Team or Sensory Support Team.

We will continue to monitor the child's progress through the ILPs and Learning Profiles, if presenting as a Developing child in any area.

### 3. PROGRESS MADE BY PUPILS WITH SEND

Below is a breakdown in the progress made by pupils with SEND, EAL and Pupil Premium pupils for each Year group for Reading, Writing and Maths. This is based on the most recent FFT grids.

<h2>Year 3</h2>	<p><b>19/86</b> children in Year 3 are SEND, 1 of which has an EHCP and 1 other an EHCNA is in the process.</p> <p><b>36/86</b> children in Year 3 are EAL.</p> <p><b>8/86</b> children in Year 3 are Pupil Premium</p>
<h2>Reading</h2>	<p><b>74%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>25%</b> of non SEND achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>26%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are achieving GD, compared to <b>58%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>16%</b> are achieving GD</p> <p><b>39%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>36%</b> of non EAL achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>67%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>14%</b> are achieving GD, compared to <b>64%</b> of non EAL achieving ARE, of which <b>12%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>38%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>36%</b> non PP achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>63%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>25%</b> are GD, compared to <b>63%</b> non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>12%</b> are GD</p>
<h2>Writing</h2>	<p><b>84%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>27%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>16%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>84%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>16%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>31%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>44%</b> non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>67%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>11%</b> are GD, compared to <b>56%</b> non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>50%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>38%</b> non PP achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>50%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>62%</b> non PP achieving ARE, of which <b>5%</b> are GD</p>
<h2>Maths</h2>	<p><b>79%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>30%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>21%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>70%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>3%</b> are GD</p>

	<p><b>36%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>44%</b> non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>64%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>5%</b> are GD, compared to <b>56%</b> non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>50%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>40%</b> non PP achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>50%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>60%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>3%</b> are GD</p>
--	---

<b>Year 4</b>	<p><b>18/91</b> children in Year 4 are SEND, 1 of which has an EHCP and 1 other an EHCNA is in the process</p> <p><b>32/91</b> children in Year 4 are EAL</p> <p><b>12/91</b> children in Year 4 are Pupil Premium</p>
<b>Reading</b>	<p><b>67%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>12%</b> of non SEND achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>28%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are achieving GD, compared to <b>88%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>12%</b> are achieving GD</p> <p><b>16%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>25%</b> non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>84%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>9%</b> are GD, compared to <b>75%</b> non EAL achieving ARE, of which <b>12%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>67%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>18%</b> non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>33%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>82%</b> non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>13%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Writing</b>	<p><b>95%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>22%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>6%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>78%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>1%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>28%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>41%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>72%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>3%</b> are GD, compared to <b>59%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>67%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>36%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>33%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>64%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>1%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Maths</b>	<p><b>72%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>21%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p>

	<p><b>26%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>79%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>7%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>25%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>34%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>75%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>33%</b> are GD, compared to <b>66%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>1%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>67%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>25%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>32%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>75%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are GD</p>
--	--

<b>Year 5</b>	<p><b>21/90</b> children in Year 5 are SEND, 2 of which have an EHCP and 2 others EHCNA are in process</p> <p><b>30/90</b> children in Year 5 are EAL</p> <p><b>17/90</b> children in Year 5 are Pupil Premium</p>
<b>Reading</b>	<p><b>25%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to % of non SEND achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>24%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>10%</b> are achieving GD, compared to <b>88%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>23%</b> are achieving GD</p> <p><b>27%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE, <b>27%</b> of non EAL children are also achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>73%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>23%</b> are GD, compared to <b>73%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>18%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>29%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>26%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>71%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are GD, compared to <b>74%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>23%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Writing</b>	<p><b>76%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>25%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>24%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>75%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>30%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>40%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>70%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>3%</b> are GD, compared to <b>60%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>5%</b> are GD</p>

	<p><b>47%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>34%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>53%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are GD, compared to <b>66%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>4%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Maths</b>	<p><b>76%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>14%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>24%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>10%</b> are GD, compared to <b>86%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>25%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>23%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>32%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>77%</b> EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>33%</b> are GD, compared to <b>68%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>15%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>29%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>29%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE also</p> <p><b>71%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>12%</b> are GD, compared to <b>71%</b> of non PP children also achieving ARE, of which <b>23%</b> are GD</p>

<b>Year 6</b>	<p><b>16/89</b> children in Year 6 are SEND</p> <p><b>19/89</b> children in Year 6 are EAL</p> <p><b>10/89</b> children in Year 6 are Pupil Premium</p>
<b>Reading</b>	<p><b>31%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>11%</b> of non SEND achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>69%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are achieving GD, compared to <b>89%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>40%</b> are achieving GD</p> <p><b>21%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>11%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>79%</b> EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>26%</b> are GD, compared to <b>89%</b> non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>34%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>20%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>11%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>80%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>10%</b> are GD, compared to <b>89%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>35%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Writing</b>	<p><b>62%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>16%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>31%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>0%</b> are GD, compared to <b>84%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>30%</b> are GD</p>

	<p><b>26%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>24%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>74%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>21%</b> are GD, compared to <b>76%</b> of non EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>26%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>20%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>13%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>80%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>10%</b> are GD, compared to <b>87%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>27%</b> are GD</p>
<b>Maths</b>	<p><b>19%</b> of SEND children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>14%</b> of non SEND children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>81%</b> of SEND children are achieving ARE, of which <b>6%</b> are GD, compared to <b>86%</b> of non SEND children achieving ARE, of which <b>44%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>16%</b> of EAL children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>14%</b> of non EAL children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>84%</b> of EAL children are achieving ARE, of which <b>42%</b> are GD, compared to <b>86%</b> of no EAL children achieving ARE, of which <b>36%</b> are GD</p> <p><b>20%</b> of PP children are achieving below ARE compared to <b>14%</b> of non PP children achieving below ARE</p> <p><b>80%</b> of PP children are achieving ARE, of which <b>30%</b> are GD, compared to <b>86%</b> of non PP children achieving ARE, of which <b>38%</b> are GD</p>

#### 4. UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SEND SYSTEM

The interventions for SEND across the school are as follows:

Interventions for SEND in Year 3:

- Busy Hands x1 a week
- Lego Therapy x1 a week
- Reading x4 groups x1 a week
- Maths x4 groups x2 a week
- Comic strip conversations x1 a week

Interventions for SEND in Year 4:

- Phonics x2 a week
- Busy Hands x1 a week
- Reading x3 groups x1 a week

#### 4. UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SEND SYSTEM

- Plus one (Maths) x3 a week
- Nessy x5 a week

Interventions for SEND in Year 5:

- Reading x4 a week
- Spelling Made Easy x2 a week
- Rapid Maths instead of Maths lessons x2 groups x4 a week
- Nessy x4 a week

Interventions for SEND in Year 6:

- Plus one (Maths) x3 a week
- Nessy x4 a week

See separate spreadsheet for entry assessment levels for Maths, Reading and Spelling

Other interventions for Year 6 are based around the need for Year 6 SATs, these are set by the year 6 teachers and change regularly due to the needs for SATs.

ILP targets are set linked to the interventions and set by teachers. This is supported by the TAs as they carry out the interventions. Teachers set targets in the Autumn term, these are then reviewed in Spring term and then new targets are set ready for the Summer term. Targets are once again reviewed at the end of the Summer term ready for the children to move into their new year groups. The ILPs are shared with parents and the pupils where appropriate. Staff gather pupil voice with regards to sharing the targets and finding out from pupils their barriers to learning as well as what they feel they are good at or enjoy in and out of school. This is all part of the graduated approach, Assess, Plan, Do, Review.

ILPs now have a scoring system for an entry and exit score for each target. This will then give me further understanding of which areas the SEND children are struggling the most in. When teachers write the targets, they score from 1-10 where they feel that child is starting at. Once the targets get reviewed they will then score them again to show the progress. This will be used to support them setting the next set of targets. It will also allow me to provide further data around our SEND children in the future. (see example ILP)

This year 2 EHCNA's have been applied for by school. Both are for Year 5 pupils whom are achieving below ARE and still working on Pre-Key stage levels across the curriculum. Despite many interventions and support in class both pupils are still below ARE and their SEMH needs are having an impact on their learning. Unfortunately, the evidence for both applications was not enough for the LA to agree to an assessment for an EHCNA, however, both sets of parents have appealed the LA's decision. 1 of the appeals has now resulted in the LA agreeing to the EHCNA. The 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal has not been discussed at panel at this stage and therefore we are waiting for a decision.

I am currently gathering evidence for a further 2 EHCNA's. 1 for a year 3 pupil who came to us this year, presenting with a learning difficulty which is impacting on her ability to complete her work independently and needing a lot of support from the adults working with her. She is undergoing assessments at the Child Development Centre for ASD as well as Social Communication Needs. After a discussion with an Educational Psychologist, it was felt that the evidence I have is almost enough and once we have completed at least one further round of ILPs it would be enough to apply for the EHCNA. The 2<sup>nd</sup> child is a year 4 child with severe speech and language needs. This child is achieving below ARE against the Pre-Key stage levels across the curriculum and due to his S&L needs he is unable to access the curriculum without heavy adaptations and a lot of adult support. Again, after a discussion with an EP, it

#### 4. UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SEND SYSTEM

was agreed that the EHCNA evidence was almost ready to be sent off. I am hoping to send both applications off by the end of the Summer term.

#### 5. WORK WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Throughout this year we have had support from the following external agencies:

- Educational Psychology
- Occupational Therapy
- Autism and Social Communication Team
- Speech and Language
- Child Mental Health Service
- Child Development Centre

#### 6. TRAINING

At the beginning of the Spring term the SEND and Inclusion Team from SENAT presented 2 staff meetings around adaptations in teaching and learning. Staff seemed to find this training helpful and took lots of ideas from the staff meetings.

We have 2 INSET days in the Summer term. The 1<sup>st</sup> one we have the ASCT joining us to carry out training around Understanding Autism and Emotional Regulation. During the 2<sup>nd</sup> INSET day we have LBAT attending to carry out training around Understanding and Responding to Behaviour.