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| Introduction |
| ***This report provides a summary of the responses from the SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17. As a part of a self-improvement system, this report offers a snapshot of SEND in Bristol and supports schools in understanding how their SEND provision compares within Bristol and nationally.***  The SEND Inclusion Audit was designed by the Specialist Education and Access Service at the request of the Inclusion Reference Group. It was written in conjunction with other teams and services such as Trading with Schools, Early Years and the Birth to 25 Integrated Service. Originally the SEND Inclusion Audit was piloted via Survey Monkey but later became an EXCEL document (based on feedback). You can find out more about the SEND Inclusion Audit, and download the latest version from [www.findabilitybristol.org.uk/pages/home/information-for-professionals/schools-and-educational-settings/send-inclusion-audit](http://www.findabilitybristol.org.uk/pages/home/information-for-professionals/schools-and-educational-settings/send-inclusion-audit). |
| Audit Returns |
| Every mainstream school was invited to complete the SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17. It is a non-statutory audit but all school are required to consider how they are supporting and improving the outcomes for pupil with special educational needs and/or a disability and should evidence this is part of a programme of school improvement. 85 schools returned their SEND Inclusion Audit, resulting in a return rate of 62%. The data within this audit is based on the returned SEND Inclusion Audits. |
| Data |
| Schools were asked to return their SEND Inclusion Audits to the Local Authority. These have been stored in a secure drive (with limited access) and the results make up the data within this report. The data in this report has not been split into age ranges or phases of education. Instead it gives an overview across the city for school age children. In addition to local data this report uses national data that is provided through data collections like the School Census. When using national data sets a comparison to statistical neighbours is included (if available). Using statistical neighbours helps us to understand what our performance is like compared to other Local Authorities with similar populations, budgets and size. Bristol’s statistical neighbours are: Portsmouth, Southampton, Sheffield, Bournemouth, Brighton and Hove, Leeds, Reading, Coventry, Derby, and Plymouth. |
| Scoring |
| Within the SEND Inclusion Audit there were 12 sections. The first section looked at school/setting details. This report looks at the remaining sections of the audit. The table below details the sections in the audit and the number of questions within each section. The maximum score for the audit is 120 points.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Section** | **No of questions in the section** | **Max. score** | | [1. School/Setting Details](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'1. School Details'!A1) | n/a | n/a | | [2. SEND Cohort Data](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'2. SEND Cohort Data'!A1) | n/a | n/a | | [3. Leadership](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'3. Leadership'!A1) | 5 | 10 | | [4. Training](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'4. Training'!A1) | 5 | 10 | | [5. Policies & Records](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'5. Policies & Records'!A1) | 6 | 12 | | [6. Local Offer](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'6. Local Offer'!A1) | 3 | 6 | | [7. Graduated Approach - SEN Support](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'7. Graduated SEN Approach'!A1) | 13 | 26 | | [8. EHC Plans and Statements](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'8. EHC Plans'!A1) | 3 | 6 | | [9. Funding](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'9. Funding'!A1) | 2 | 4 | | [10. Participation](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#'10. Participation'!A1) | 8 | 16 | | [11. Transitions](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#RANGE!A1) | 3 | 6 | | [12. CYP in Specific Circumstances](file:///C:\Users\brsbns1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.MSO\B5812BE.xlsx#RANGE!A1) | 12 | 24 | | **Total for Audit** | 60 | 120 | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SEND Cohort Data | |
| Figure 1.1 shows the percentage of pupils with SEN from the returned SEND Inclusion Audits compared to statistical neighbour average and the English average. | |
|  | |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17 and Statistical First Release 2016* |
| Figured 1.1 shows that the results from the SEND Inclusion Audit are similar to the data collected through the School Census. It also indicates that the percentage of pupils on SEN Support is 1% lower than compared to statistical neighbours while the percentage of pupils with EHCP/Statements of SEN is 0.2% higher in comparison. | |
| Figure 1.2 summarises the primary needs of pupils with SEN (pupils with EHCP/Statements and on SEN Support). For this section schools were asked to give details of pupils whose primary need had been formally identified and pupils whose primary need was emerging or informally defined. This data suggests the number of pupils with Moderate Learning Difficulty and Social, Emotional and Mental Health Needs informally identified is significantly higher than the number of pupils formally identified. | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17.* |

|  |
| --- |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17 and Statistical First Release 2016.*  **Note on Figure 1.3**  The data used from the Statistical First Release is only based on state funded primary and secondary schools. In the SEND Inclusion Audit data on Visual, Hearing and Multi-Sensory Impairments were not asked for separately and so the total for these from the Statistical First Release have been added together to ease comparison. The same applies for Other Difficulty/Disability & SEN Support but no specialist assessment of need type. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 1.3 summarises the primary needs of pupils with SEN in Bristol, based on the SEND Inclusion Audit, in Bristol based on Statistical First Release (SFR) data (which is based on School Census data collections), and for Statistical Neighbours based on Statistical First Release data. With a 63% return rate on the SEND Inclusion Audit it would be expected that the number of pupils under the different SEN types would be lower (by approximately a third) than the pupil numbers within the Statistical First Release data. Taking into account the return rate of the SEND Inclusion Audit the data suggests the following:   * The School Census data for Bristol suggests we have higher number of pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders compared to our statistical neighbours. * Schools have returned significantly less pupils with Specific Learning Difficulties in their SEND Inclusion Audit compared to Schools Census data. * The School Census data suggests we have a significantly higher number of pupils with Specific Learning Difficulties compared to our statistical neighbours. * In the SEND Inclusion Audit Moderate Learning Difficulties and Social, Emotional and Mental Health Needs returned significantly less numbers in comparison to the School Census data. * If 100% of the SEND Inclusion Audits were returned the number of pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders would probably be higher than the number of pupils in the School Census Data. * If 100% of the SEND Inclusion Audits were returned the number of pupils with Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulties would be significantly higher than the number of pupils in the School Census data. * If 100% of the SEND Inclusion Audits were returned the number of pupils with Speech, Language and Communication Needs would be less than the School Census data suggests. | |
|  |  |
| Figure 1.4 shows the pupil numbers by the broad categories of need, as outlined in the SEND Code of Practice 2015. | |
|  | |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17 and Statistical First Release 2016.* |
| The broad categories of need take into account the School Census categories and enable an overview of pupil with SEN. Figure 1.4 suggests:   * If 100% of SEND Inclusion Audits were returned the number of pupils in each category would probably be higher than the number collected through the School Census. * In all of the broad areas of need Bristol has higher numbers of pupils than compared to statistical neighbours based on School Census data. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Section 3 to 12 Summary | |
| The average score for sections 3 to 12 in the SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17 was 95 points. Figure 2.1 shows how the points were distributed. | |
|  | |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |
| Figure 2.2 shows the average scores of the SEND Inclusion Audit as a percentage of the maximum score (120) for sections 3 to 12 of the SEND Inclusion Audit. | |
|  | |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |
| The average percentage score for all sections was 70% or higher except section 6. Local Offer which returned an average score of 49%. The best performing area was 7. Graduated SEN Approach. | |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Leadership | |
| Section 3 of the SEND Inclusion Audit looked at leadership in schools, reflecting on how the leadership within school carry out their responsibility to children and young people with SEND and CYP in specific circumstances. Figure 3.1 shows the result from the returned audits. | |
| Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions was ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Schools were least confident in their contribution to the development of SEND in the Local Area (question 5). * This was followed by having a strategic overview of SEND funding within the school and management committees, governors, etc, having a strategic overview of SEND and children/young people in specific circumstances. |  |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |
|  | |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| National Survey: Senior Leadership vs Class Teacher views of SEN. | |
| **Teacher voice omnibus: May to July 2016 survey - DfE questions**  In 2016 the Department for Education (DfE) submitted 30 questions to be included in the Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey and a Senior Leader Booster Survey. The data on this page shows the results of what senior leadership views were in comparison to class teacher views. This was a national survey that had representation from primary and secondary school phases.  Overall for this section of the surveys senior leadership felt more confident than class teachers about SEN in their schools. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| *Source: Teacher voice omnibus: May to July 2016 survey - DfE questions:* [*www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-voice-omnibus-may-to-july-2016-survey-dfe-questions*](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-voice-omnibus-may-to-july-2016-survey-dfe-questions) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Training | |
| Section 4 was on training within schools and reflected on what training staff had. | |
| Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * To the questions 1 and 2 most schools responded a high rating for SENCO and Designated Teacher for Children in Care being suitably qualifications. * Schools were less confident about staff having up to date training, with the highest responses of ‘not started yet’ for question 3 (training suitable to the role the member of staff is in). |  |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |
|  | |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policies & Records | |
| Section 5 reflected on whether schools had the policies and documents they are required to have by law and explored how these policies/documents are made available and how schools maintain good records. | |
| Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Schools were most positive about having a SEN Policy that is up-to-date (question 1). * They were least confident about having Accessibility Plans, Child in Care Policies and Supporting Pupils at School with Medical Conditions policies that are up-to-date. * 61% of schools were confident that they demonstrated good record keeping (question 6). |  |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |
|  | |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Local Offer | |
| Section 6 reflected on how schools are participating in the development of Bristol's Local Offer. | |
| Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘started or some elements completed’. * 32% of schools had not yet registered on Findability (question 1). * Schools also rated low for parent/carers being aware of the where to access Local Offer information and in supporting the development of the Local Offer (questions 2 & 3). |  |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |
|  | |
| *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Key Stage 1 Attainment |
| From 2012 to 2015 Key Stage 1 attainment for pupils with SEN was based on the *percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above in key stage 1 teacher assessments in Reading*. In 2016 this was changed to the *percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in key stage 1 teacher assessments in Reading*. Data collections to form these percentages are returned nationally and enable us to compare performance within Bristol and against statistical neighbours and the rest of England. The points below summarise this data for 2012 to 2016 and is based on  Phonics screening check and key stage 1 assessments: England 2012 to 2016.  [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-1](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-1)  **SEN Support**   * For pupils with SEN but without an EHCP/Statement (SEN Support)in Bristolthe percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above in Key Stage 1 teacher assessments (Reading) has been consistently lower than the statistical neighbour average and English average. In 2014 and 2015 the difference was 1%. In 2016 this increased to 2%. **This suggests** **Bristol continues to perform below** **statistical neighbour and English averages and this gap is growing.** * The percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above in Key Stage 1 teacher assessments (Reading) with no identified SENin Bristolwas higher than the statistical neighbours average (from 2012) up until 2016 when it dropped to align with statistical neighbour average. As the percentage of pupils with no SEN drops and the percentage of pupils with SEN Support continues to increase (in line with the statistical neighbours average and the English averages **the gap between those with SEN Support and those with no SEN in Bristol is narrowing by 1-2% per year.**   **EHCP/Statement of SEN**   * The percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above in key stage 1 teacher assessments (Reading) with an EHCP/Statement in Bristol was significantly higher in 2013 than the statistical neighbour average and the English average. This dropped in 2014 to below both the statistical neighbour average and the English average. It rose again and is now 2% higher than the statistical neighbour average and 1% higher than the English average. **This suggests that gap between Bristol and the statistical neighbour and English averages for the percentage of pupils with an EHCP/Statement of SEN****achieving level 2 or above in key stage 1 teacher assessments (Reading) is narrowing and is now above both English averages and statistical neighbour averages.** * After the drop in 2013 the percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above in key stage 1 teacher assessments (Reading) with an EHCP/ Statement has been increasing each year. The percentage of pupils with no SEN has been performing in line with statistical neighbour averages for the last two years**. This suggests that the** **gap between those with an EHCP/Statement of SEN and those with no SEN has been narrowing (by 7% in 2014 & 2015). This is however still below the gap in 2013 (when the percentage for those with EHCP/Statement of SEN was 10% above statistical neighbour averages).**   The graph below shows the progress of pupils with no SEN, SEN without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement of SEN. **Note**: the data from 2016 is not comparable to previous data and therefore should not be taken as an indication of progress or trajectory. |

|  |
| --- |
| Key Stage 2 Attainment |
| From 2012 to 2015 Key Stage 2 attainment for pupils with SEN was based on the *percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 Reading*. In 2016 this was changed to the *percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard at Key Stage 2 (Reading, Writing and Mathematics)*. Data collections to form these percentages are returned nationally and enable us to compare performance within Bristol and against statistical neighbours and the rest of England. The points below summarise this data for 2012 to 2016 and is based on National curriculum assessments at key stage 2. [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-2](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-2)  **SEN Support**   * In 2012 the percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 (Reading*)* with SEN but without an EHCP/Statement of SEN was the same as the statistical neighbour average and in 2013 it was 1% higher. In 2014 and 2015 the percentage then dropped below the statistical neighbour average but in 2016 the percentage rose to 2% above (with the new data collection). Until 2016 the percentage of pupils was consistently below the English average and is now 1% above. **This suggests Bristol now performs better than statistical neighbour and English averages.** * The percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 (Reading*)* with no identified SENwas higher than statistical neighbours until 2014 when it dropped. In 2015 it then rose and is now above both the statistical neighbour average and the English averages. The gap between those with SEN Support and those with no SEN was narrowing until 2015 when it grew by 4%. **The new measure introduced in 2016 suggests that Bristol is now performing better than the statistical neighbour and English averages for both SEN Support and no SEN and this therefore suggests that** **the gap between SEN Support and No SEN is no longer growing.**   **EHCP/Statement of SEN**   * The percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 (Reading*)* with an EHCP/Statement in Bristol was lower than the statistical neighbour average and the English average in 2012 but from 2013 it rose by 13% and has been consistently above until 2016 (and the introduction of the new data collection) when it has dropped 3% below the statistical neighbour averages and the English average. From the percentage rise in 2013 there was not more than a 1% increase which indicates the trend in increasing percentages was not similar to the statistical neighbour averages or the English average. **This suggests the growth in percentage increase was not in line with the grown in statistical neighbour averages or English averages and therefore with this current trend the gap will continue to grow.** * Since 2013 the percentage of pupil achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 (Reading*)* with no SEN has stayed within a 1% increase/decrease, as has the percentage of pupils with an EHCP/Statements of SEN. In 2016 the new measure indicated an increased percentage of pupils with no SEN and a decrease for pupils with an EHCP/Statement of SEN. **This suggests if the trends remain the same with the new measure as it was with the old one (2012-2015) the gap between those with an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with no SEN will remain the same.**   The graph below shows the progress of pupils with no SEN, SEN without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement of SEN. **Note**: the data from 2016 is not comparable to previous data and there for should not be taken as an indication of progress or trajectory. |

|  |
| --- |
| GCSE Attainment |
| From 2010 to 2014 GCSE attainment for pupils with SEN was based on the *percentage achieving 5+ A\*-C grades inc. English & mathematics GCSEs*. In 2016 this was changed to the a*verage Progress 8 scores.*  Progress 8 aims to capture the progress a pupil makes from the end of primary school to the end of secondary school. This data has been included but there is not enough information available to suggest any trends. Data collections to form these percentages are returned nationally and enable us to compare performance within Bristol and against statistical neighbours and the rest of England. The points below summarise this data for 2012 to 2014 and 2016 and is based on GCSE and equivalent results. [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-gcses-key-stage-4](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-gcses-key-stage-4). There is no data available for 2015.  **SEN Support**   * Between 2010 and 2013 the percentage of pupils achieving 5+ A\*-C grades inc. English & mathematics GCSEs with SEN but without an EHCP/Statement of SEN (SEN Support) in Bristol was below or in line with the statistical neighbour average and English average. In 2014 the percentage rose to 1.8% above the English average and 3.9% above the statistical neighbour average.  **This suggests that in Bristol the percentage of pupils with SEN Support achieving 5+ A\*-C grades was increase faster than trends in the statistical neighbour average and English average and in 2014 was higher than both those averages.** The average progress 8 score for 2016 indicates that progress between the end of primary school and the end of secondary school for pupils with SEN Support was 0.1 points below the statistical neighbour average and 0.2 points below the English average. * The percentage of pupils achieving 5+ A\*-C grades inc. English & mathematics GCSEs with no identified SEN in bristolwas consistently lower than the statistical neighbour average and the English average until 2014. While the percentages for pupils with no SEN were lower they did show an increase year on year. The percentage of pupils with SEN Support did not increase year on year between 2010 and 2013 but for that period the percentage did increase overall. **This suggests that the percentage gap of pupils with SEN Support and no SEN was on average growing (by 1% each year from 2012 to 2014).**   **EHCP/Statement of SEN**   * The percentage of pupils achieving 5+ A\*-C grades inc. English & mathematics GCSEs with an EHCP/Statement in Bristol was 5% higher than the statistical neighbour and English average in 2010 but dropped year on year until by 2013 it was 3.1% lower than the statistical neighbour average and 5.3% lower than the English average. In 2014 the percentage rose by 4.6% to become in line with the statistical neighbours average but was still below English averages. **This suggests that the percentage had been declining for years but had showing an increase in 2014.** The averages for Progress 8 score showed that progress between the end of primary school and the end of secondary school for pupils with an EHCP/Statement of SEN was in line with the statistical neighbour averages but 0.3 points below the English averages. * Percentages of pupils achieving 5+ A\*-C grades inc. English & mathematics GCSEs with no SEN increased year on year whereas percentages of pupils with an EHCP/Statement of SEN decreased until 2013. **This suggests the gap between the percentage of pupils with an EHCP/Statement of SEN and pupils with no SEN has increase year on year between 2010 and 2014.**   The graph below shows the progress of pupils with no SEN, SEN without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement of SEN. **Note**: the data from 2016 is not comparable to previous data and there for should not be taken as an indication of progress or trajectory. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Graduated Approach – SEN Support | |
| Section 7 reflected on how schools are implementing a graduated approach to special educational needs, starting with how they prepare pupils for adulthood. It also included working with parents and carers as partners in the identification of emerging needs and keeping records of individuals' needs and progress. | |
| Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Schools score highest around teachers being able to identify when an assessment from a specialist is required (question 11). * On average schools did not rate themselves highly around the Preparing for Adulthood Outcomes. |  |
|  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* |

# 

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | EHC Plans & Statements | | | Section 8 reflected on school responsibilities around Education, Health and Care plans, including carrying out Annual Reviews and requesting an Education, Health and Care needs assessment. | | | Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Overall schools were confident about EHC Plans and processes. * The area that was rated lowest was the processes for requesting an EHC Plan. |  | |  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Funding | | | Section 9 reflected on the funding available to schools to meet the needs of pupils with SEND and CYP in Specific Circumstances. | | | Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * The responses for both these questions were similar with supporting good outcomes for pupils scoring slightly lower (question 2). |  | |  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |  | | | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Particpation | | | Section 10 reflected on how schools work with pupils, parents and carers to understand provision and be involved in the progress pupils makes. | | | Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Schools rated question 4 (having a key person in the school) highest. * The questions that schools were least confident with were around opportunities for parents to develop their schools and services in Bristol. |  | |  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |  | | | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Transitions | | | Section 11 reflected on how schools effectively support pupils during transitions between key phases of education and during other times, including how careers advice is delivered. | | | Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * Schools rated lowest the question about re-integrating pupils who have temporarily transitioned out of their setting (question 2). * Question 1 about support pupils with SEND in transitions throughout the day rated the highest. |  | |  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |  | | | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | CYP in Specific Cirumstances | | | Section 12 reflected on school’s duties to pupils in specific circumstances, for example Children in Care or those at risk of offending. | | | Overall for this section:   * The highest rating for all the questions were ‘embedded and reviewed as necessary’. * The questions that scored highest were children being bullied, those receiving support from Early Help and Children in Care (questions 9, 5 and 1). * The questions that score lowest were about youth offending and young carers (questions 11 and 12). |  | |  | *Source: SEND Inclusion Audit 2016/17* | |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix 1 – Key Stage 1 Attainment |
| The graphs below show attainment of pupils with no SEN, SEN but without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement in Key Stage 1. They are based on data from **Phonics screening check and key stage 1 assessments: England** 2012 to 2016: [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-1](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-1) |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| Appendix 2 - Key Stage 2 Attainment |
| The graphs below show attainment of pupils with no SEN, SEN but without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement in Key Stage 2. They are based on data from **National curriculum assessments at key stage 2**. [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-2](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-key-stage-2). |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix 3 – GCSE Attainment |
| The graphs below show attainment of pupils with no SEN, SEN but without an EHCP/Statement of SEN and with an EHCP/Statement at GCSEs. They are based on data from GCSE and equivalent results [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-gcses-key-stage-4](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-gcses-key-stage-4). There is no data available for 2015. |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
|  | | | |
|  | | | |
| Appendix 4 – Question Scores | | | |
| The table below shows the total points for all the questions from all the audits returned. It starts in descending order, the question that scored the least when all the audits are put together. | | | |
| Question | score |
| 1) Your school/setting is registered on Findability: Bristol's Local Offer. | 56 |
| 7) Your school/setting make sure parents/ carers have the opportunity to participate in the development of services in Bristol. | 78 |
| 12) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils at risk of offending or about to enter custody at the end of the year. | 79 |
| 11) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils are young carers. | 87 |
| 3) Your school/setting co-operates with the Local Authority in the development of the Local Offer. | 92 |
| 6) Your school/setting make sure parents/ carers have the opportunity to participate in the development of your setting. | 93 |
| 5) Your school/setting make sure all pupils have the opportunity to participate in the development of your setting and services in Bristol. | 95 |
| 2) You ensure parents and carers are aware of where they can access Local Offer information. | 97 |
| 4) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are missing education because of reduced timetables, low attendance including school refusers or school phobic - Pupils Missing Education (PME) | 101 |
| 2) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are recently adopted. | 102 |
| 3) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are accessing alternative learning provision. | 102 |
| 4) Your setting has a Child in Care Policy that is up-to-date/ regularly reviewed. | 102 |
| 5) Your setting has a Supporting Pupils at School with Medical Conditions policy that is up-to-date/ regularly reviewed. | 103 |
| 3) Your setting has an Accessibility Plan that is up-to-date/ regularly reviewed. | 104 |
| 8) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are unwell or medically unable to attend school (including Hospital Education). | 104 |
| 10) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils with mental health, anxiety or emotional wellbeing difficulties. | 106 |
| 3) Your school/setting support pupils with SEND in reaching the preparing for adulthood outcomes of community inclusion. | 106 |
| 6) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are experiencing bereavement/ loss/ separation or emotional trauma, including C/YP of prisoners. | 106 |
| 5) Your setting contributes to the development of SEND in the Local Area. | 107 |
| 8) Your school/setting is as physical accessible as possible (all reasonable adjustments have been made). | 109 |
| 4) Your school/setting support pupils with SEND in reaching the preparing for adulthood outcomes of independent living. | 111 |
| 2) Your school/ setting supports pupils who have temporarily transitioned out of your setting to re-integrate. | 112 |
| 10) Teaching staff are able to identify when a pupil is not making expected progress with school based interventions through a process of review. | 113 |
| 3) Staff receive relevant, up-to-date training to support pupils with special educational needs, suitable for their role. | 113 |
| 6) You demonstrate good record keeping that enables you to identify the needs of pupils in your school. | 113 |
| 7) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who have received fixed term exclusions. | 113 |
| 1) Your school/setting support pupils with SEND in reaching the preparing for adulthood outcomes of employment and meaningful activity. | 114 |
| 2) Your school/setting support pupils with SEND in reaching the preparing for adulthood outcomes of good health. | 114 |
| 8) Teaching staff use educational setting based plans to meet the identified needs of pupils (based on the settings based assessments). | 115 |
| 4) There is strategic overview of SEND funding in your school/setting. | 116 |
| 5) Staff have receive relevant and up-to-date training to support pupils in specific circumstances. | 116 |
| 9) Educational setting based plans are delivered using the setting's resources. | 116 |
| 5) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are known to Social Care /Early Help. | 117 |
| 9) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are being bullied or at risk of being bullied and pupils who are bullies. | 117 |
| 4) Staff have receive relevant and up-to-date training to support pupils with specific special educational needs, suitable for their role. | 118 |
| 5) Teaching staff are able to support pupils appropriately to their needs through high quality first teaching.  (for early years settings include the statements in the box below) | 118 |
| 6) Your school/setting effectively uses their RAISE data to look at progress and attainment of pupils with SEND. | 118 |
| 12) Teaching staff seek assessments from specialists when necessary. This is then used to effectively deliver an additional cycle of plan, do and review. | 121 |
| 1) Staff in your school/setting understand their duties to and the needs of pupils who are Children in Care. | 123 |
| 1) The setting's governing body/ management committee/ board of trustees carry out their responsibility to pupils with SEND and in specific circumstances. | 123 |
| 7) Teaching staff effectively use setting based assessments to identify when a pupil may have SEND. | 124 |
| 2) There is a Designated Teacher for Children in Care at your setting with suitable qualifications. | 126 |
| 13) Your setting makes Top Up applications when appropriate (assessment for additional funding) and deliver a cycle of assess, plan, do and review process. | 127 |
| 1) Staff understand the process of requesting an Education, Health and Care needs assessment. | 128 |
| 2) The setting's senior leadership team carry out their responsibility to pupils with SEND and in specific circumstances. | 128 |
| 2) Your school/setting uses best endeavours to engage parents/ carers with their child's education. | 128 |
| 2) Your school/setting uses funding to support good outcomes for pupils in specific circumstances. | 128 |
| 2) Your setting has an SEN Information Report that is up-to-date/ regularly reviewed with parents/carers and young people (if applicable). | 128 |
| 3) Your school/setting makes sure that all pupils are part of the school/ setting's community. | 128 |
| 1) Your school/setting uses funding to support good outcomes for pupils with SEND. | 130 |
| 3) The SENDCO is part of the school/settings leadership. | 131 |
| 3) The setting understand how it must implement Education, Health and Care plans (including Annual Reviews). | 131 |
| 11) Teaching staff are able to identify when a pupil will require any assessment from specialists. | 133 |
| 3) Your setting effectively supports pupil with SEND in transitions at key stage changes. | 133 |
| 1) There is a SENDCO at your setting with suitable qualifications. | 134 |
| 1) Teaching staff recognise that parents/ carers know their children best. | 135 |
| 4) Pupils and parents/ carers have a key person at the school/setting. | 135 |
| 2) Your school/setting understands how it should respond to consults to place a pupil with an EHC Plans/ Statements | 136 |
| 1) Your setting effectively supports pupil with SEND in transitions during the school/setting day. | 138 |
| 1) Your setting has an SEN policy that is up-to-date/ regularly reviewed. | 138 |