

Sabbatical Report

Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special education needs and disabilities The SEND Framework (UK).

Co-located Special Schools (UK).

Graeme H Daniel

Principal Allenvale School, President SEPAnz.

September/October 2015

I acknowledge the Ministry of Education for providing the opportunity for principals to investigate areas of interest, the Allenvale Board of Trustees, the senior management team of Allenvale School, the Special Education Principals Association NZ (SEPAnz) Executive, the Ministry for Education London, high profile special education leaders and head teachers of the schools visited.

Executive Summary

The UK Government's Ministry for Education, published a Consultation document (green paper) in March 2011, *Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability*. This paper was driven by disabled students and students with SEN and their families experiencing frustration in gaining support and services. For students with the most complex needs this can affect their quality of life and that of their families.

The new framework has been implemented into practice for the last year. This report explores the enablers and barriers to its implementation. The Ministry of Education in New Zealand have been discussing how the special education service delivery can be reviewed to improve early identification of need and response, having parents and education providers at the centre of decision making, providing a single point of contact and provide a managed education pathway and to address the funding fragmentation across special education. As the New Zealand Special Education 'Update' is not dissimilar to the key areas of focus of *Support and Aspiration*, I have drawn some recommendations from this study for the New Zealand Special Education framework and service delivery Update.

The Christchurch Education Renewal Project was developed by the Ministry of Education following the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011. The project included the opportunity to investigate the future shape of the greater Christchurch special schools network. The two

options proposed were the co-location with a regular school or the status quo. That is, the special schools would remain on their current sites and be repaired. The board of Allenvale School supported the option of a new build co-located with a regular school as being a viable option for the future. Visiting a number of co-located schools in the Greater London area provided an opportunity to consider the enablers and barriers to a successful co-location of a special school with a regular school. This report provides some recommendations for those special schools considering co-location.

The purpose of this sabbatical was to:

1. To consider the impact of the UK Government Ministry for Education's *Support and Aspiration* Policy implementation. A new policy framework for special educational needs and disabilities.
2. To explore the enablers and barriers that are evidenced through examples of co-location between a special school and a regular school in the UK.

Rationale:

1. The New Zealand Ministry of Education have, during 2015, considered how the special education system could be improved to ensure that there is less fragmentation in the system and to consider how best to meet the needs and aspirations of learners with diverse needs from early childhood to tertiary level. The Ministry is also interested in exploring how other government departments, Health and Social Development may work collaboratively in the interests of the student. Currently there is insufficient coordination between these government departments which can compromise students with SEND and their families.

The Special Education Update in New Zealand has a strong resemblance to the UK Government's framework model for students with SEND. The areas of focus are: 1. Improve early identification of the need for additional support and early response. 2. Place schools at the centre of making decisions and coordinating additional support the child requires. 3. Provide a single point of contact, for as long as it's needed for everyone involved in the child's education. 4. Provide a managed education pathway that supports the child to achieve - from assessment of need through to completion of their education. (A single plan).

The UK Government's Ministry for Education, published a Consultation document (green paper) in March 2011, *Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability*. This paper was driven by disabled students and students with SEN and their families experiencing frustration in gaining support and services. For students with the most complex needs this can affect their quality of life and that of their families.

The Ministry for Education has, under the leadership of Edward Timpson, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Children and Families, implemented significant policy changes to ensure that students who have Statements of SEND (currently being transformed into Education, Health and Care Plans) receive an education of choice by improving the range and diversity of schools from which parents can choose including a preference for a state-funded school including special schools, Academies and Free Schools.

The five areas of focus are: 1. Early identification and assessment – a single assessment process and Education, Health and Care Plan 2. Giving parents greater control. 3. Learning and Achieving. 4. Preparing for adulthood. 5. Services working together for families.

The intention was to explore the enablers and barriers to this policy implementation.

2. The Special Schools network in Christchurch have been given the opportunity to consider co-locating the base schools with a regular school as an option for the future provision of special education as part of the Education Renewal Programme following the Christchurch Earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. All three special day schools will provide an Outreach Service to students in regular schools along with a network of satellite school provision. There are some identified risks that require mitigation to ensure the boards can move forward with confidence; the emotional and physical safety of the students of the special school, the independence of the schools as self-managing schools and agreements around the sharing of facilities and resources.

The intention was to explore the success of co-located special schools in the greater London area, what were the enablers to a successful co-located schools and how any barriers were mitigated. In addition I intend to investigate the value added learning outcomes that are evident for students with special educational needs and disabilities who are attending a special school in a co-located environment.

Methodology:

I met with and interviewed Ministry for Education Officials in London, head teachers of special schools, high profile leaders in special education and academics with significant special education knowledge and experience.

The following documents provided an insight into the new SEND Framework,

1. The Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 – 25 years. Statutory Guidance for organisations which work with and support children and young people who have special educational needs or disabilities.
2. Policy Provision and Practice – the SEND Code of Practice.
3. The SEN Reforms in Islington – Advice, Guidance and Expectations,
4. SEND funding: longer term changes – Call for Evidence: summary of responses July 2015.

5. Children & Families Board Special Educational Needs Reforms – Update
6. High Needs Group Research on funding for young people with special educational needs
7. The SEND Code of Practice 0 – 25 Years Rona Tutt & Paul Williams.

I visited a number of co-located special schools in the Greater London Area including The Bridges School, The Richard Cloudsley School, The Samuel Roads School and Bedersford School. Visits were also made to meet with the Executive Heads of Westminster Special Schools, and Ridgeway School in Farnham.

Findings:

1. **To consider the impact of the Support and Aspiration Policy implementation. The new policy framework for special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).**

Ofsted's *The Special Education Needs and Disability Review: A Statement is not Enough*, (Ofsted 2010) stated that "no one model – such as special schools, full inclusion in mainstream settings or specialist units co-located with mainstream settings, worked better than any other. This is borne out by many case studies that show effective practice across the range of settings. The government considered that change was necessary as the previous system was too complicated, was expensive and delivered poor outcomes.

Families who have children with SEND, were informing Local Authorities (LAs) across the country that they sometimes found it hard to get the support they needed because they did not find services very 'joined up' in the way they work. That meant that they often had to tell their story repeatedly and manage relationships with a range of different practitioners. The Government has introduced legislation (the Children and Families Act, 2014) that required all Local Authorities to work in a new, more co-ordinated way from September 2014.

The Children and Families Act 2014 introduced a new assessment process for children and young people from birth to the age of 25 with learning difficulties or disabilities that results in a single Education, Health and Care Plan (EHC Plan). Personal budgets have been introduced along with a 'Local Offer' that is designed to assist families to understand and compare the resources available from the Local Authority.

The new SEND Code of Practice for 0 – 25 years (2015) establishes the right of children, young persons and families to impartial information and advice, to request an EHC assessment, to be consulted by Local Authorities and others providing services and to be involved in policy development. The code also sets out expectations on local authorities,

health services and providers in regard to joint commissioning, the Local Offer and the assessment processes that lead to an EHC Plan.

A National Overview was undertaken jointly by Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission into the readiness of LAs to implement the reforms set out in the Children and Families Act 2014. The report acknowledged that social care and health services face particular challenges in maintaining their statutory obligations while making changes and shifting the culture within their professional settings. It also identified areas that are insufficiently developed:

- Identifying and meeting social care and health needs, joint commissioning and a lack of focus to achieve good outcomes.
- The inconsistency of Local Offers and communication to parents and caregivers of disabled children along with limited involvement of parents and caregivers in decisions about local provisions.
- A lack of a shared understanding of what constitutes 'good progress' for the lowest attaining children and young persons and the monitoring of the impact of early intervention.
- The development of personal budgets.
- The advice urged the Department for Education, the Department for Health and the Department for Social Care to consider an inspection of the effectiveness of Local Authorities in fulfilling their responsibilities.
- The Government have since announced that they will begin a national SEND inspection regime from April 2016.

In June of 2015, the Department for Education published research on funding for young people with SEND. The report:

- Recommended a fairer distribution of funds would be achieved if the Disability Living Allowance was included as a formula factor;
- That schools are not effectively utilising the first £6,000 for students with high needs and recommended that the Local Offer Framework includes a core entitlement that all schools will provide for students with SEND and that the Disability Living Allowance is considered an indicator of need.
- That notional SEN budgets are not working well for schools and that these should be removed; and
- That there are clear nationally applied arrangements for allocating money outside of the formula in exceptional cases.

[Ministry for Education Great Smith Street London.](#)

- Implementation of the SEND framework is in its first year
- Children and Families Act 2014 – The principles underpinning the Code of Practice require Local Authorities to have regard to the views, aspirations and feelings of the child or young person and their family, for them to participate as fully as possible in informed decision making and to prepare the child's parents to facilitate the best

possible educational and other outcomes for their child for post school life. These principles are considered to be a strong enabler to the framework.

- There is improved synergy between Special Education Needs and Disability.
- Transformational change is occurring across the sector.
- The new policy has refined the system and built on good practice.
- Co-production – working with the sector to ensure the best outcomes are achieved for the student and their family.
- Parent groups – Parent/Carer Forums – Each Local Authority receives £15,000 from the Ministry each year to support the parent/carer groups. They are involved in shaping provision, many have legally binding agreements, underpinned by the Children & Families Act. Feedback from these groups shaped the Code of Practice 0 – 25 years 2015. This has raised credibility of the new framework for parents and providers.
- Independent Supporters – (£30,000 cost). These individuals assist families with the Education, Health & Care Plan (EHC Plan). Students aged between 0 – 25 years are eligible for an Education, Health and Care assessment, (previously 0 – 16 years of age). These supporters ensure families are aware of entitlements and informed of what they can expect.
- Statements (the previous model that enabled access to higher funding support) are to be transformed into EHC Plans by 2018 – therein reviewed annually.
- Evidence of collaboration is required to ensure parent/students involvement in the development of the EHC Plan.
- The parent nominates their preferred school. The Local Authority can only over rule the parent if a preferred school is considered unsuitable. This decision is evidenced based.

Barriers:

- Some Local Authorities are not yet empowering the parent groups as expected (as required under legislation).
- The transition from ‘Statementing’ to the EHC Plan is considered by some to be too slow. Others consider the process required further considerations before implementation.
- Education is facing resource cuts – a significant barrier. Key personnel in the Ministry have retired and not been replaced. This has impacted on the implementation of the framework.
- Schools are not prepared for the post 16 year old expectations of the new policy framework.
- Getting the right balance between central government involvements with local government is a challenge.

Leaders of special education - SEND Framework. (Synthesis)

- A significant cultural shift for education.
- There is a presumption of mainstream schools first.
- Children and their families are at the centre – co-production.
- Pathfinders, some Local Authorities have trialled aspects of the new framework over a two year period.
- Found that parents felt very involved in the process.
- The focus of the plan is to meet the aspirations of the family and student with a focus on outcomes.
- The Local Authority manage the co-production of the EHC Plan with input from Health and Care
- All Statements will be converted to EHC Plans by March 2018
- Personal budgets (for additional support over and above school funding) can be managed by the Local Authority, an independent third party or parents themselves.
- Local Offer. Local Authorities are required under legislation to seek the views of parents and publish on their website what they offer for students with SEND. Parents/carers can compare one Local Offer with another
- Parent/carers can ask questions on the Local Offer, these will be published as will the response by the Local Authority.
- Statementing Officers are being retrained to work with families to develop EHC Plans.
- SENCOs play an important role in school coordination – manage external specialist input referrals. SENCO's are now required to have a Masters in Education.
- The SEND Code of Practice requires that all teachers have a responsibility for meeting the needs of students with SEND.

Barriers:

- Disability Lobby Groups believed the changes to the Act should not have included special schools as an option. These lobby groups were unsuccessful in achieving their aim. There was strong opposition from parents who wish to make these decisions for themselves. This is mirrored in New Zealand by NGOs such as IHC, CCS and IEAG who believe that we have a parallel system of education in New Zealand with regular and special schools and this system is often justified on the basis of choice. They further cite research that supports their claim that students with SEND who attend regular schools achieve better outcomes. There is research that challenges this assertion. These lobby groups do not speak for all families who have a child with a disability.
- The EHC Plans have no prescribed structure
- Local Authority Local Offers do not have a prescribed structure – difficult to navigate for parents and carers.
- At this point there is limited provision for the 19 – 25 year olds
- Timing of transformation of Statementing to EHC Plans has been problematic – the transformation should have been phased in over a longer period.

National Association for Special Educational Needs (NASEN) - SEND Framework. (Synthesis)

NASEN is an education and development charitable organisation based in the United Kingdom which aims to promote the education, training, advancement and development of all those with special and additional support needs.

- NASEN was involved in the development of the SEND Framework policy.
- Framework and underpinning principles great – some excellent practice one year into the transformation however some not so positive.
- The Ministry for Education lost some key people (drivers and shakers) and this has had an impact on implementation.
- Believes the framework has some similar elements to the Scottish model, *Getting it Right for Every Child* (GIRFEC).
- Believes the Scottish model is more balanced and equitable
- The GIRFEC model refers to 'Additional Support Needs' as opposed to the use of 'special'.
- Isn't so sure that the required engagement with families (legislation) will necessarily increase as required as some Local Authorities are holding on to the old ways.....
- The EHC Plan is a great idea and is primarily managed by the education sector.
- Implementation not yet imbedded.
- There is a greater focus on early intervention and providers of this service.
- The new policy framework has resulted in a significant change in the role of SENCOs – must be qualified teachers and undertake a national qualification.
- SENCOs lead the EHC Plans in schools.

Barriers:

- Difficulty in engaging with Health and Social Services (Care).
- Lack of inter departmental thinking within Department for Education.
- Early Years have missed out on funding support to implement the new framework.
- There appears to be a lack of accountability for those who have received implementation funding.
- There is no single appeal model – appeals sit with each Local Authority.
- There is a need for more effective communication systems for effective implementation.
- 16 – 25 year old – grave concerns, many 16+ have not received a new EHC Plan and are missing out, schools not well prepared to receive this group.
- Project Search would assist meeting the needs of this 16 – 25 year old group.
- Parents are challenged by the new process.
- Personal budgets – low uptake from families at this point.

Islington Special Education Division Local Authority.

- The government is reconsidering the current methodology of High Needs Funding.

- The EHC Plans – education is seen as the spine with links to health & care as appropriate.
- A third of all EHC Plans have the education component only.
- The balance are primarily Education and Health.
- Each school receives a notional £10,000 per student with SEND using proxy indicators cf. incidence.
- Recent research suggest that to improve equity for the notional funding, that any student who has a disability allowance should qualify and that this should be included in the indicator scale.
- The EHC Plan generates additional top up funding – it is a significant challenge to get this right.
- The maximum costs for a regular school = £35,000 - includes teaching component.
- The maximum costs for a special school = £36,000 - includes teaching component.
- The Ministry for Health provides funding to schools for all specialist therapies.
- If a child has an approved EHC Plan, the parents can make the choice of school including a special school.
- Transport is provided to regular and special schools by the Local Authority.

Barriers:

- Considers the personalisation focus as in the draft reports for the new framework were “lost in translation” Not a focus of the Code of Practice.
- The EHC Plan needs to be personalised – focus on outcomes rather than inputs – this is proving to be a challenge.
- The EHC Plan top funding mechanism is proving to be complex.
- Shortage of quality providers for students with SEND.
- Private providers of residential special needs services are proving to be a challenge in terms of costs – Local Authorities are purchasing placements in these residential settings for up to £300,000 annually.
- OFSTED’s evaluation framework is not meeting the needs of all learners.

Head teachers’ views on the first year of implementation. (Synthesis)

- Special Schools already had personal centred planning, the EHC Plan is not new to this sector.
- Most EHC Plans (60%) are education based only. Education is the spine of the plan.
- Health have been particularly responsive to the legislative changes.
- Special schools (high performing) were given the mandate to convert their plans to the EHC Plan requirements.
- Each Local Authority provide their own template for the EHC Plan.
- The Local Authority signs off the completed ECH Plan.
- Islington Borough Is considered to be well ahead with the personalised funding aspect of the framework.

- Special schools receive Top- up Funding through the EHC Plan. This Top-Up Funding will vary according to need. Special Schools also receive regular school funding of 4,000 pounds per student. In addition £6,000 is allocated to all students with SEND in all educational settings.
- Parents now can demand, under the new regulations, their school of choice including special schools.
- Schools are to work with Colleges to develop transition processes from special schools into post school college programmes.

Barriers:

- The Department for Education have demonstrated a lack of knowledge in the implementation process.
- The Pathways project (trialling of the new Framework in several Local Authorities) has not resulted in the learning expected.
- The EHC Plans should have been trialled before the framework and Code of Practice implemented. There have been some lost opportunities particularly in the development of personalised planning.
- It has proven difficult to engage Social Care in the development of the EHC Plan when needed.
- Bureaucracy can be a challenge at times.
- Parents do not always understand the process.
- The mainstream is particularly challenged to implement the new framework.
- There is no single model for the EHC Plan – this causes difficulties when a student moves from one local authority to another.
- If a student is attending a special school out of Borough, the school has to negotiate with that Borough for funding.
- Challenges remain with getting the funding equitable. All students generate £4,000 with all students with SEND receiving an additional £ 6,000 with top up funding generated through an Education, Health & Care Plan. Top -Up Funding (evidenced based) will be dependent on the severity of the disability and how many bands (4) in the funding matrix the student meets.
- Young persons with SEND aged 19 – 25 are now eligible for an EHC Plan. However the government is now stating only if the outcomes of the plan leads to employment.
- Many colleges are not able to offer suitable programmes for 19 – 25 year olds with SEND.
- There is a need for increased provision for residential care for severely disabled students however there are limited facilities available.

The Scottish Model: Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC)

GIRFEC is a consistent way for people to work with all children and young people. It's the foundation for all children's services and can also be used by practitioners in adult services who work with parents or carers.

The model helps practitioners focus on what makes a positive difference for children and young people – and how they can act to deliver these improvements. GIRFEC is being embedded through all existing policy, practice, strategy and legislation affecting children, young people and their families.

What getting it right for every child means for children, young people and their families:

- *They understand what is happening and why*
- *They have been listened to carefully and their wishes have been heard and understood*
- *They will feel confident about the help they are getting*
- *They are appropriately involved in discussions and decisions that affect them*
- *They can rely on appropriate help being available as soon as possible*
- *They will have experienced a more streamlined and coordinated response from practitioners*

For practitioners:

- *Putting the child or young person at the centre and developing a shared understanding within and across agencies*
- *Using common tools, language and processes, considering the child or young person as a whole, and promoting closer working where necessary with other practitioners*

For managers in children's and adult services:

- *Providing leadership and strategic support to implement the changes in culture, systems and practice required within and across agencies to implement GIRFEC.*
- *Planning for the transition as staff in agencies move from the current working processes to the new child-centred processes*

Foundations of getting it right for every child

The GIRFEC model is based on sound foundations. There are ten core components and a set of values and principles which bring meaning and relevance at a practice level to single-agency, multi-agency and inter-agency working across the whole of children's services. They can be applied in any setting and circumstance where people are working with children and young people.

Core components

Getting it right for every child is founded on ten core components which can be applied in any setting and in any circumstance.

1. *A focus on improving outcomes for children, young people and their families based on a shared understanding of wellbeing*
2. *A common approach to the proportionate sharing of information where appropriate*
3. *An integral role for children, young people and families in assessment, planning and intervention*

4. *A co-ordinated and unified approach to identifying concerns, assessing needs, and agreeing actions and outcomes, based on the wellbeing Indicators*
5. *Streamlined planning, assessment and decision-making processes that lead to the right help at the right time*
6. *Consistent high standards of co-operation, joint working and communication where more than one agency needs to be involved, locally and across Scotland*
7. *A Named Person for every child and young person, and a Lead Professional (where necessary) to co-ordinate and monitor multi-agency activity*
8. *Maximising the skilled workforce within universal services to address needs and risks as early as possible*
9. *A confident and competent workforce across all services for children, young people and their families*
10. *The capacity, proportionately and appropriately, to share demographic, assessment, and planning information within and across agency boundaries*

The Getting it right for every child approach

The GIRFEC approach is about how practitioners across all services for children and adults meet the needs of children and young people, working together where necessary to ensure they reach their full potential. It promotes collaboration and accountability that:

- *builds solutions with and around children, young people and families*
- *enables children and young people to get the help they need when they need it*
- *supports a positive shift in culture, systems and practice*
- *involves working better together to improve life chances for children, young people and families*

Planning, taking action, and reviewing (GIRFEC)

The GIRFEC model requires that any child or young person who requires additional help should have a plan to address their needs and improve their wellbeing. This will be a single child's plan, but may involve more than one agency.

GIRFEC promotes an integrated and co-ordinated approach to multi-agency planning. It looks to practitioners to work in accordance with legislation and guidance but also expects agencies to think beyond their immediate remit, drawing on the skills and knowledge of others as necessary and thinking in a broad, holistic way. For example, a care plan for a child looked after by the Local Authority, a health care plan, or an individualised education plan should be incorporated within the single child's plan where the child or young person's circumstances require this.

The plan must include the views of the child or young person and their parents/carers. It must be outcomes based and reviewed regularly to ensure positive outcomes are achieved.

Recommendations: Implications for the NZ Special Education Update

1. The discussion phase of the Special Education Update was too short. The policy review and implementation in the UK has taken several years
2. Any policy changes must be trialled before nationwide implementation.
3. Early identification and intervention are critical. All Early Intervention Providers, including NGOs should be adequately funded. Additional costs would be recoverable in the longer term.
4. The proposed managed education pathway from early intervention through to the end of a student's education needs to be a single plan with a design that is consistent across the country.
5. The managed pathway (single plan) should include input from Health and the Ministry of Social Development where appropriate.
6. The plan should be outcomes driven.
7. EHC Plans in the UK have a single point of coordination. The NZ plan would be best managed by SENCOs.
8. Parents must be provided with all options for their child's education. These options should be included on the Ministry of Education's Website. This would be comparable to the "Local Offer" that Local Authorities in the UK are required by legislation to publish.
9. Parents should be at the centre of decision making in partnership with schools.
10. The Ministry of Education should consider a funding band for those students with moderate needs in addition to the ORS scheme that caters for students with high or very high needs.
11. The Scottish 'Additional Support Needs' terminology used in the GIRFEC model is considered to be less of a label than Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Removal of the word special from Special Education in New Zealand should be considered. A more inclusive terminology would be appropriate.
12. Section 9 Agreement. If a student is ORS verified, the requirement for a Section 9 Agreement should be removed from the Education Act 1989. In the UK and Scotland, when a student has an approved single plan, the parent has a choice of what school their child attends, including a special school. A Section 9 Agreement may be required for students attending a residential school, a non ORS placement generated by the Ministry and for students over the age of eighteen attending a specialist setting.
13. High performing special schools should be resourced to provide professional learning and development to schools within their catchment areas. Many special schools in the UK are providers of PLD to regular schools to build capability of teachers in the area of special education.

2. To explore the enablers and barriers that are evidenced through examples of co-location between a special school and a regular school in the UK.

Co-location was first established in Oxfordshire in the 1980s. The two models of co-location are one where the classes of both schools are mixed with each other, common areas are shared and resources are fully shared. The second is where the special school and the regular school are physically adjoined but operate as two separate schools. It is likely under this model that the special school will have access to the regular school resources and that staff will share one staffroom. The administration area may or may not be shared. Students from the regular school may access specialist teaching from the special school. PLD opportunities can be shared across both schools.

Head teachers' views on co-location of special schools. (Synthesis)

Enablers:

- Where Local Authorities had a clear vision for co-location, the outcomes were more likely to be successful.
- The ideal is to have the co-located schools built at the same time to ensure that the two schools are able to ensure some key facilities are shared and leaders of each school shared the same vision for co-location.
- It was considered that a shared staff room was essential.
- Independent governance, leadership and financial independence are seen as essential.
- Leadership essential. The heads of each school must have a commitment to inclusive practice. Without this, the co-location will fail.
- Leaders of each school must be committed to the process from the outset and agree to a shared vision.
- Communication is vital between all parties from the outset and through the development stages.
- Protocols are essential to ensure sustainability. This statement of practice must be signed by all parties from the outset.
- Each school has its own governance with one member attending the other governing board meetings.
- Staff of the regular school benefit from receiving 'disability training'.
- Occasional shared staff meetings were considered invaluable.
- Students of the regular school benefit from training in 'inclusive interaction'.
- Initially pairing up teachers from each school was considered beneficial.
- Where the secondary co-located schools have supported an inclusion process position that encouraged an increase in inclusion projects between the two schools, success has been excellent.

Barriers:

- Where secondary co-located special schools were not as successful, the regular school had experienced some challenges with its performance and were more focused on their own issues, i.e. curriculum focused. This resulted in a demarcation between the schools.
- Integration of all classes of each school with shared governance was considered by all head teachers to be undesirable.
- Some secondary schools co-located with a special school considered that increased inclusion projects would create 'curriculum damage' for their students.
- It was clear that generally it was the special schools that took the lead in developing inclusion projects and there was limited cross fertilisation.
- Inclusion meetings for regular school staff in most schools visited were not as effective as hoped by the head teachers of the special school.

Recommendations:

Essential elements for successful co-located schools.

1. The key to a successful co-location is the commitment and leadership of the two principals. Without a commitment to inclusive practice, the co-located schools will be in name only.
2. It is essential that the co-located schools retain their governance and management independence.
3. The principles and philosophy of the co-located schools must be agreed and signed off from the outset.
4. An agreement in relation to resource sharing must also be agreed and signed off from the outset.
5. The building of the schools should be an integrated and concurrent process either directly accessible side by side or one school on the ground floor with the other on the first floor with a shared reception area and some shared facilities – e.g. pool, hall.
6. It is essential that there is a shared staff room.
7. Students should retain their school identity through their school's uniform.
8. Staff of the regular school should receive PLD in relation to disability awareness on an ongoing basis.
9. Reciprocal social inclusion is essential.
10. Reciprocal learning and teaching inclusion projects are essential.
11. The special school should have a facility to provide Outreach Professional Development for mainstream education.

12. Full primary schools are the preferred partner for a co-located special school.
13. It is essential that co-located schools maintain a post 16/17 year old transition facility.

References

DfE (2010) *Green Paper: Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities – Call for Views*. London: HMSO

DfE (2011) *Support and Aspiration: A New Approach to Special Education Needs and Disability – a Consultation*. London HMSO

DfE (2012) *Support and Aspiration: A New Approach to Special Education Needs and Disability- Progress and Next Steps*. London: HMSO

DfE/DoH (2014) *Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25 Years*, www.govt.uk/government/publications

Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC) <http://www.scotland.govt.uk/gettingitright>

Islington Local Authority (2014) *SEN Reforms in Islington, Advice, Guidance and Expectations*. London

Ofsted (2010) *The Special Educational Needs and Disability Review: A Statement is not Enough*. Manchester: Ofsted Publications

Tutt,R & Williams,P (2015) *The SEND Code of Practice*. London SAGE Publications Ltd.