

Sheffield Graduated Approach Model

Parent feedback on draft templates

Feedback gathered at Education Subgroup meeting on 1 December 2017.

In attendance: Rhona Dodds, Sarah Ewbank, Jeremy Spooner, Genna White, Joanne Ferguson, Julie Chambers, Anne Snowdon, Eva Juusola.

General comments

- Many parents don't know which type of plan their child has. It would be helpful to design a distinctive cover page for each, so that it's easier to tell them apart. However, any graphics should be printer-friendly and not rely on the use of colours.
- It would be useful to include a brief introduction explaining the purpose of each document at the top.
- The terminology used is not consistent between the templates. For example, the boxes "What is happening in education to achieve this?" (Support Plan) and "Education provision to meet the outcome" (EHC plan) refer to the same thing, so they should have the same title. We would prefer clear and simple terminology to be used throughout, i.e. "Strengths", "Needs", "Provision", NOT "What is working/not working?", "What is in place to support needs" etc.
- There is quite a lot of duplication between the documents, which needs to be removed. For example, both the MyPlan and the EHC Plan have a section "How best to communicate with...", but this is already covered in the Learner Profile.
- We need a leaflet that explains the graduated approach and the type of children the different documents are intended for. This should include timelines and flowcharts, illustrating who does what at each point. It is important to explain the role of the parents at each stage.
- All of the documents need a version control box.
- We find that schools don't always involve parents as they should do, e.g. staff might create a one-page profile and not share this with parents, or they might ask parents to populate parts of the My Plan, the fail to fill in the school sections. A good way of avoiding this would be to require schools to ask parents to sign **each** of the documents.
- SENCOs often say that they feel like "the blind leading the blind". School staff will need a rolling training programme and comprehensive guidance notes.
- It is essential that guidance notes and exemplars are made available on the Local Offer website as soon as the templates are rolled out.

Learner Profile

- This should be the standard for all children, not just those with SEND. It would be particularly useful for transitions.
- It is not helpful to have everything written in the voice of the child. For example, "How I'm doing in my learning" should be changed to "Levels (name) is working at". Mixing the use of "I" and "We" in the table ("When I do this... We think it means... And we should") makes no sense.

- Replace “What is important to me in the future” with “The hopes and dreams that CHILD and their family have”, and make this consistent with the corresponding sections in the Support Plan, My Plan and EHC plan. We need to make sure that the parents’ views are included in this.
- Add an optional “Diagnosis” box. Explain in the guidance notes that this should only be used for medically confirmed diagnoses, and only if parents / young person think it would be helpful.
- Add an extra box “What NOT to do”. This would help staff to avoid triggers.
- We are not sure whether the box “How I’m doing in my learning” is needed. What is the purpose of it – is it to give supply teachers a snapshot of the child’s functioning, so that they can differentiate the lesson? Lesson plans may be a better way of doing this. There is no consistent use of assessment systems in Sheffield, e.g. some schools use STEP or P levels, others don’t. And what would you do in secondary school – list ALL of the subjects?
- Explain in the guidance notes:
 - How the profile should be filled in, and who should be involved
 - How the profile should be used. Could there be a flash on the register for any pupil who has a learner profile?
 - How it should be reviewed
 - The purpose of the document: a good communication tool; can make initial discussions with parents easier
 - “Things that are important to me” can be used as motivators
 - Confidentiality

Support Plan

- We are not sure about listing things like Child Protection Plans. Will parents be happy for this information to be shared widely? There could be data protection issues. Schools should already have this information on their systems anyway.
- The document does not encourage schools to be clear and specific about the provision they are putting in place. Instead of “What is happening in education to achieve this?”, this section should be called “Educational provision”. This would make it consistent with the MyPlan and EHCP. The section should be broken down into “Who – Does what – How often – For how long”. This would also help schools to quantify the financial impact of interventions.
- In the Progress Review section, add a box “What needs to change?”, so that agreed actions can be logged
- Explain in the guidance notes:
 - Who should have access to the plan
 - Ownership - who is responsible for creating, storing, and managing plans in a setting
 - When a new plan is created at the start of the school year, the previous version should NOT be deleted. It would be good to include a list of previous plans for reference. This is important so that interventions that were unsuccessful are not repeated
 - Guidance on coproduction with parents
 - Guidance on reviewing the plan – this should NOT be done at a normal parents’ evening
 - Explain scaling
 - How to write SMART outcomes (these must be measurable, otherwise scaling will be subjective)

My Plan

- **Page 2:** Could you list a few examples of education advisory services (HI, VI, Autism Service) and therapy services (SLT, OT, Physio, CAMHS etc.)
- **Page 5:** Most of the information from the Learner Profile and some information from the Support Plan is repeated here. The only sections that are different are History and Background, impact of child's SEND on the family, impact of family life on child's education, and the transition section. Keep those, but delete everything else.
If an impact on the family has been identified, there needs to be an **action**, e.g. Carer's Assessment, referral to Sheffield Young Carers, etc.
Add a section about siblings. This is particularly important if siblings attend the same school.
- **Page 9:** Listing the primary/secondary needs in line with DfE guidance could come across as "downgrading" to parents, e.g. if a child with a diagnosis of autism now only has "social and communication difficulties". Presumably this is just a data collection box – is it really needed? It would be better to have a "diagnosis" box.
We don't like the use of "What's working?" and "What's not working?" instead of "Strengths" and "Needs". It seems rather crude (e.g. "The child's legs are not working")
There needs to be a proper provision section, especially if the provision section in the Support Plan is so weak.
Page 11: Again, the use of "what's working / not working?" to describe a learner's strengths and needs is not ideal. It would be good to have a list of "Preparing for adulthood" targets (quite detailed, e.g. "being able to call the GP to make an appointment").
- The Support Plan should be included towards the end of the MyPlan.
- We liked the confidence ratings in the old MyPlan template – why have they been removed? This is a useful tool which is becoming more widely used, e.g. in weight loss or smoking cessation programmes – provides a reality check. It would also enable the local authority and locality SENCOs to see which schools may require additional support, and which ones are doing well.

EHC Plan

- **Page 5:** Same comments as for My Plan – remove sections that are already included in the Learner Profile or Support Plan, e.g. What's working, What's not working, How best to communicate, Hopes and dreams. Change "The journey so far" to "History and background" to make it consistent with the My Plan
- **Page 9:** Same comments as for MyPlan - listing the primary/secondary needs in line with DfE guidance could come across as "downgrading" to parents, e.g. if a child with a diagnosis of autism now only has "social and communication difficulties". Presumably this is just a data collection box – is it really needed? It would be better to have a "diagnosis" box.
We don't like the use of "What's working?" and "What's not working?" instead of "Strengths" and "Needs". It seems rather crude (e.g. "The child's legs are not working")
- **Page 14 onwards:** The linking of outcomes and health, education and social care provision is good, as it provides increased rigour.
Rather than listing the broad areas of need, it would be better to list the individual child's actual needs that the provision is meant to address.
- **Page 19:** A personal budget is just information – it does not automatically follow that a parent would receive a direct payment and put in place provision themselves.

Annual Review Record

- Add a question: “Has the provision described in sections F/G/H1/H2 been fully implemented?” The Local Government Ombudsman has issued a recommendation that Sheffield City Council should monitor whether provision in section F is being made. The annual review would be an ideal opportunity to do this. We imagine that the CCG would want to monitor implementation of the Health section as well.
- Page 3: Scaling will only be useful if the outcomes are written in a way that progress is measurable
- Page 3: “Should the plan be maintained or ceased?” is not a Yes/No type question.
- Explain in the guidance notes:
How settings should invite parents to submit their views before the annual review meeting, and any forms to use
How settings should circulate any reports at least 2 weeks before the annual review meeting
That it may not be appropriate to involve the learner in the whole meeting