INTRODUCTION

This assignment is designed to incite debate as to whether learners who have been identified as having an increased possibility of becoming NEET (Not in Education Employment and Training) at school leaving age, would be more likely to progress positively at Post 16 should they receive mandated support through successfully meeting assessment criteria for the allocation of an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).

Six months prior to writing the assignment, the author submitted a 4000 word assignment investigating whether a mandatory collection and publishing of standardised Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) data would aid in reducing numbers of Post 16 NEETs. The author concluded that 'red' RONI learners should be added as a category to existing Pupil Premium data, which is mandatory and nationally recognised. It was proposed this may then enable schools to direct additional, Pupil Premium, funding for those identified learners (who would not have previously qualified) to additional intervention strategies and/or alternative academic offers to facilitate positive progression at Post 16.

As a continuation of the study, this assignment aims to explore if those same identified learners would have been eligible to access EHCPs with outcomes focused on positive Post 16 progressions and transitions and subsequently would the numbers of Post 16 NEETs be reduced?

LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

This assignment makes reference to populations who have been formally identified as having Special Educational Needs (SEN). In the context of this assignment, a child or young person is referred to as a 'learner'. A learner is deemed to be aged between 14 and 16 and attending full-time educational provision. Many references that equally focus on securing outcomes for education and training and health and social care have focused solely on education and training aspects. Direct references to the Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) Code of Practice (CoP) are recognised by **[   ]**.

The Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice

The SEND CoP became statutory guidance for organisations, which work with and support children aged between 0 and 25, who have special educational needs or disabilities in January 2015. The SEND CoP replaced the previous SEN Code of Practice (2001), increasing the focus on successful transitions to adulthood, involving learners and parents in making decisions and replacement of previous assessment methods with one coordinated assessment process. The SEND CoP relates specifically to Part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014 and associated regulations. The SEND CoP describes statutory requirements that cannot be ignored by using the term '**must**' instead of '**should**' in relation to recommendations.

Special Educational Needs

The SEND CoP identifies a learner as having SEN if they have a learning difficulty or disability, which calls for special educational provision to be made for them (SEND CoP, [xiii]. A learner is defined as having a learning disability if:

- They have a significant greater difficulty in learning that the majority of others of same age

- They have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age in mainstream provisions (SEND CoP, xiv).

The Equality Act (2010, 6) defines a disability as "a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term negative effect on ability to do normal daily activities". The Equality Act 2010 Guidance (2010, A5) lists impairments to include developmental disorders such as Autistic Spectrum Disorders, dyslexia, dyspraxia and learning disabilities. In addition, the Guidance (2010, B9) references the effects of behaviour; "it would **not** be reasonable to conclude that a person who deployed an avoidance strategy was not a disabled person… **it is important to consider the things that a person cannot do, or can only do with difficulty**". The Guidance further describes effects of the environment and effects of treatment, which may be translated as relevant to learners who struggle to remain in mainstream school lessons and complete set learning tasks. In 2009 (Table Di), one local authority (LA) exclusion statistics showed 27.6% of fixed term and 36.4% of permanent exclusions were due to persistent disruptive behaviour.

SEN Support and Education Health and Care Plans

Cheminais (2015, p.13) clearly outlined the main difference in provided support for SEN learners from the 2001 SEN CoP to the 2015 SEND CoP. Learners previously labelled as 'School Action' and 'School Action Plus' have been replaced with 'SEN Support' and learners who previously had a 'Statement' and 'Learning Difficulty Assessment' are assessed for their eligibility to be issued with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).

Cheminais further described 'SEN Support' as "differentiated approaches and high quality personalised teaching targeted at their area of weakness for… when falling behind peers or continues to make less than expected progress given their age and starting point".

In contrast, Education, Health and Social Care needs assessments determine if one single ECHP that records required Education, Health and Social Care provision is necessary to enable additional support for learners. An EHCP focused on outcomes, from birth to the age of 25, would be issued for more complex and severe needs, where progress remained less than expected despite additional and differentiated SEN support being put in place.

LEARNERS IDENTIFIED AT A HIGH RISK OF BECOMING 'NEET'

Persons who are 'not in education, employment or training' are commonly defined as 'NEETs' throughout the UK. Generically, in UK media and statistic, NEETs are referenced as being aged between 16 (school leaving age) to 19, or up to the age of 25 if they are a 'care leaver' or to have 'special educational needs'.

Risk of NEET Indicators (RONIs)

In the academic year 2009/10, Maguire and Newton (2013, p.7-8) made one of the earliest published references to 'RONIs' when they documented 20 LAs as developing them.

Following research seeking specifically to develop indicators for the early identification of young people at risk of temporary disconnection from learning, Filmer-Sankey and McCrone (2012, p.v) suggested that,

> Local Authorities and schools would welcome a list of indicators to **guide** them in their identification of young people at risk of becoming NEET… which give them flexibility to include local factors… a national set of indicators is not perceived to be workable as there is considerable variation by, and within, Local Authorities.

In 2011, one LA formulated their own list of RONIs and communicated them to all schools. Where a learner met three or more of their identifiers they nominated them as red, a high risk. With only two identifiers, amber (a medium risk) and with either zero or one identifier, green (a low risk). Adapting the RONIs slightly throughout their development, this particular LA currently identifies RONIs as where a learner:

- Had SEN status

- Was pregnant or a teenage mother

- Was a looked after child

- Was supervised by the Youth Offending Team

- Did not achieve the LA average score at KS2

- Did not achieve the LA average score at KS3

- Had school attendance below 85%

- Had experienced one or more Fixed Term Exclusions

- Had experienced one or more Permanent Exclusions

Table A: One Local Authority Year 10 Risk Of NEET Indicators

Year	Red RONI		Amber RONI		Green RONI		Cohort	NEETs	
2013/14	2.9%	**168**	11.5%	672	85.6%	5,010	5,850	1.2%	74
2014/15	3.9%	**224**	16.7%	970	79.5%	4,624	5,818	*Not known*	
2015/16	3.2%	**181**	13.7%	779	83.1%	4,712	5,672	*Not known*	

Source: LA Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) Overview

In the academic year 2013/14, 168 learners were identified as having a 31%+ chance of becoming NEET at Post 16.

74 of the total number of LA cohort became NEET equating to 1.2%. 18 of the identified 168 red RONIs became NEET (10.7%), the remainder progressed onto positive post 16 destinations.

Data therefore suggests that identifying red RONI learners early, has a positive impact on Post 16 progression.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SEN AND RED RONI LEARNERS

The following table shows the frequency of RONIs for one LA's Year 10 cohort for the academic years 2014/15 and 2015/16:

Table B(i):   Year 10 One Local Authority Most Common RONI Indicators

	2014/15		2015/16	
Less than LA average KS2	2974	51.1%	2860	50.4%
SEN indicator	1176	20.2%	915	16.1%
Less than 85% attendance	338	5.8%	289	5.1%
1 or more fixed term exclusions	213	3.7%	200	3.5%
Permanent exclusion in 2013/14	0	0.0%	3	0.1%
Is working with YOS	15	0.3%	10	0.2%
Looked After Child	29	0.5%	40	0.7%
Gypsy, Roma, Traveller	4	0.1%	3	0.1%
Is school aged parent	2	0.0%	2	0.0%

Source: LA Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) Overview

Rates of Progress

Learners who do not meet the average national Key Stage 2 assessment score account for over 50% of red RONI learners in one LA's 2013/14 and 2014/15 data, as shown in table B(i). The Lamb Inquiry (2009), cited by Gross (2015) "reminded schools, *being behind your peers in learning does not itself mean that a pupil has SEN*".

Learners being 'behind average' in terms of their academic progress *may* be an indication that the learner has attributing learning difficulties in mainstream settings. Maguire (2015, p.8) aptly observed that "many young people who are NEET have average levels of attainment, live at home supported by family and, as such, can become 'invisible' ".

SEN Indicators

In 2014/15 prior to, and in 2015/16 after, the SEND Code of Practice implementation, learners identified as statemented, school action plus, or as having an EHCP (having an SEN indicator) were the second most common risk of NEET Indicators.

Data collated by one LA further indicates a relationship between numbers of learners identified as having special educational needs and those defined as NEET. This data suggests that of *actual* 178 identified NEETs, 41 had an SEN indicators (23%). 137 however, would not have received additional SEN support as they were identified as 'disadvantaged', or as eligible for 'free school meals'. 51 were not identified in any particular category. This data does not show learner RONIs as this is not a mandatory reported statistic.

Table B(i): One Local Authority: NEET Population 2013/14

CATEGORY	TOTAL NEETs	SA/SA+	STATEMENT	MAINSTREAM DISADVANTAGED	MAINSTREAM FSM
Destination Not Sustained	297 5%	93 9%	8 6%	125 12%	62 13%
Destination Not Sustained/Recorded NEET	178 3%	41 4%	0	62 6%	24 5%
Activity Not Captured in Data	119 2%	10 1%	0	21 2%	10 2%

* **Disadvantaged =** eligible for FSM in the last six years; Looked after continuously for 1 day or more; Adopted from care

Source: SFR 40/2105: Destinations of KS4 and KS5 Pupils 2013 to 2014

Social, Emotional and Mental Health Difficulties

The SEND CoP saw a change in terminology in recognising one of learners' main areas of need for additional SEN support. The category 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' (BESD) was replaced with 'social, emotional and mental health difficulties'. Norwich and Eaton (2015, p.11) observed that a consequence of this

change is that "a behaviour problem or difficulty itself is on longer seen as a SEN, in the same way that the new Code indicates that low attainment per sé does not constitute grounds for learning difficulty and SEN".

Table C: One Local Authority SEN Primary Types of Need 2015

SEN TYPE	NUMBER	%
Moderate Learning Difficulty	1956	37.9
Social, Emotional and Mental Health	769	15.3
Specific Learning Difficulty	444	8.6
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	396	7.7
Physical Disability	140	2.7
Speech, Language and Communications Needs	138	2.1
Other Difficulty/Disability	82	1.6
Severe Learning Difficulty	67	1.3
Hearing Impairment	59	1.1
Visual Impairment	47	0.9
SEN Support but no Specialist Assessment of Types of Need	18	0.3
Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulty	12	0.2
Multi-Sensory Impairment	9	0.2
TOTAL	**5157**	**1100**

Source: SFR 25/2015: Special Educational Needs in English Mainstream Schools

Data shows that for one LA in 2015, Social, Emotional and Mental Health needs accounted for over 15% of all identified SEN needs. Moderate Learning Difficulties, "where learners experience great difficulty following the curriculum despite receiving suitable help and intervention" (The Good Schools Guide, 2015), being the primary need. Red RONI learners are commonly thought of as simply 'being naughty' and having no SEN needs, however, the author would argue persistent disruptive behaviour, can often be a result of social, emotional and mental health difficulties and/or learning difficulties and therefore SEN.

Cheminais (2015, p. 92) described four instances when social, emotional and mental health difficulties may develop; family circumstances, within-child factors, school factors or classroom factors.

Of specific relevance to red RONI learners, the bold school and classroom factors, are regularly observed as leading to displays of negative and disruptive behaviours:

School Factors	Classroom Factors
An inappropriate curriculum offer Ineffective rewards system **Inflexible timetabling** Ineffective whole-school behaviour policy Inconsistently implemented behaviour policy	**Mismatch of delivery and learning styles** **Lessons being too long** Insufficient curriculum differentiation Insufficient challenge in learning activities Unclear explanations or instructions Poorly planned lessons Too much diatetic teaching Little pupil participation in learning **Inappropriate grouping/seating arrangements**

The SEND CoP clearly states that:

[6.12] All pupils should have a broad and balanced curriculum… teachers should set high expectations for every pupil, whatever their prior attainment… Lessons should be planned to address potential areas of difficulty and to remove barriers to pupil achievement.

[6.15] A pupil is SEN where their learning difficulty… or disability calls for… provision different from or additional to that normally available to pupils of the same age.

It could be argued therefore, that in a school striving to meet [6.12], but not physically able to adapt factors such as lesson timings and delivery environments due to physical constraints, a disruptive (and potential red RONI) learner would have a need to access a different, or additional education provision and therefore qualify as 'SEN'. This assignment acknowledges not all red RONI learners (solely) display disruptive behaviours. However, high numbers of red RONI learners are educated outside of mainstream educational environments (such as in Pupil Referral Units) as they experience difficulty learning alongside a majority of other learners in a mainstream educational setting. Historical exclusion data for one LA shows how 'persistent

disruptive behaviour' has long-since been the primary catalyst leading to learners being excluded from their schools:

Table D(i):   One Local Authority: Secondary Exclusions Reasons Data 2008/9

EXCLUSIONS REASON	No. PERMANENT	No. FIXED
Persistent Disruptive Behaviour	**32**	**978**
Physical assault against a pupil	16	652
Physical assault against adult	11	213
Drug and Alcohol Related	8	173
Verbal abuse/threatening behaviour	7	624
Theft	5	97
Damage to school/personal property of school community member	3	145
Other	0	185
Bullying	0	67
Sexual Misconduct	0	47
Racist Abuse	0	45
Unknown	0	8

Source: Local School Exclusion Data (anonymous)

Table D(ii):   One Local Authority: Secondary Reasons for Exclusion 2013/14

EXCLUSIONS REASON	No. PERMANENT	No. FIXED
Persistent Disruptive Behaviour	**6**	**367**
Other	0	510
Verbal abuse/threatening behaviour against an adult	0	389
Physical assault against a pupil	0	261
Drug and Alcohol Related	0	61
Verbal abuse/threatening behaviour against a pupil	0	43
Theft	0	40
Damage to school/personal property of school community member	0	27
Physical assault against adult	0	26
Bullying	0	23
Sexual Misconduct	0	9
Racist Abuse	0	17
Unknown	0	

Source: SFR 27/2015: Permanent and fixed term exclusions by reason for exclusion

With reference to disruptive behaviours inparticular, the Department for Education (2015, p.14) acknowledged that;

> consistent disruptive or withdrawn behaviours can, however, be an indication
>
> of an underlying problem, and where there are concerns about behaviour
>
> there should be an assessment to determine whether there are any casual

factors such as undiagnosed learning difficulties, difficulties with speech and language or mental health issues.

Cheminais (2015, p.94) listed ten perceived low-level and high-level behaviour disruptions. Those listed in bold can be directly referenced to a high number of fixed term exclusion reasons for one LA in 2013/14 (Table Dii);

Low-Level Behaviour	High-Level Behaviour
Calling out	Swearing
Being off task	Destroying other pupils work
Being out of seat in class	**Making sexual/racial comments**
Throwing and flicking objects or paper	**Vandalising books and equipment**
Distracting other pupils from their work	**Violent, dangerous behaviour**
Arriving late for lessons	**Bullying**
Being cheeky	**Fighting**
Talking when the teacher is talking	Walking out of class and school
Not listening to the teacher	Persistent lying
Forgetting to bring books/equipment	Bringing offensive weapons to school

A reluctance to acknowledge disruptive behaviours as a specific primary SEN need underwrites a concern that 'behaviours' could saturate the SEN support system. Resulting in the majority of funding being allocated to learners challenging behaviour as opposed to their SEN.

A report by Ofsted (2010), cited by Ekins (2012, p.109)), recorded significant concerns about the number of pupils who were inaccurately identified with SEN; "…it has been noted that pupils that do not have special educational needs, but instead of falling behind and underachieving within the school context are being incorrectly identified as having SEN".

The Department for Education (2011) cited by Ekins (2012, p.109) expanded that "over-identification of pupils on the SEN Register… harm(s) pupils who do not have SEN… as too often the label excuses inaction: slow progress by some children is

deemed satisfactory because of a non-existent special need… and can mean they do not get the right help".

In summary, the Department for Education appears to both support and challenge the notion that displays of negative and disruptive behaviours may indicate a learner has an SEN, but, they aim to avoid over-identifying behaviours as SEN.

This potential confusion is echoed by Norwich and Eaton (2015, p.12) who astutely commented that:

> "if there was a problem with the (former) BESD category, then it was the ambiguity and diverse use, something that persists with the new Code. Removing the term 'behaviour' from the new category does not mean that challenging, disruptive or disturbing behaviour will not be taken into account in the using the new term".

A question remains, how does a learner displaying persistent disruptive behaviour access additional support to meet their learning needs, if they are unable to access the full range of SEN support through an EHCP?

ASSESSING LEARNER'S NEEDS

Nettleton and Friel (2015) summarised that the SEND CoP "makes it clear that:

- Schools should assess each pupil's current skills and levels of attainment on entry;

- Class and subject teachers, supported by the senior leadership team, should make regular assessments of the progress of all pupils;

- Where pupils are falling behind or making inadequate progress, given their age and starting point, they should be given extra support".

To aid in assessing learner's potential difficulties, the Department for Education (2015, p.16) recommended use of a 'Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) as simple, evidence based tool to help consider the full range of a learner's behaviour, or alternatively, utilising the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process involving a range of professionals.

This suggests, that in the first instance, a red RONI learner displaying persistently disruptive and negative behaviours (types likely to lead to exclusion) would first need to access higher quality and specifically differentiated teaching targetting their area of weakness (including changes to the previously referenced school and classroom factors). An assessment of needs could follow, through completion of an SDQ or CAF. The outcome would lead to eligibility for an EHCP assessment and potential issue of an EHCP, or, the learner remaining eligible only for internal 'SEN Support'.

For learners who do not qualify for EHCPs and continue to display disruptive behaviours that impede their learning and progression, the question remains; how are they then able to access the intense support that they need in order to positively progress at post 16?

HOW EHCPs COULD AID POSITIVE PROGRESSION OF 'RED RONIs'

The SEND CoP makes twelve references (Appendices i) to enabling and supporting positive progression at school leaving age. [8.21] perhaps states the most concise expectations:

> As children approach the transition point, schools and colleges should help children and their families with more detailed planning. E.g. in Year 9, they should aim to help children explore their aspirations… FE colleges and sixth forms can now recruit students directly from 14… In Year 10 they should aim to support the child and their family to explore more specific courses or places to study… In Year 11 they should aim to support the child and their family to firm up their plans for the post-16 options and familiarize themselves with the expected new setting;

Of the twelve SEND CoP post 16 references, four are statutory requirements. It therefore translates, that any learner issued with an EHCP will be provided with increased and personalised support to aid their positive progression at post 16.

Red RONI learners are believed to be at high risk of becoming NEET at post 16, therefore they would be highly likely to benefit from tailored support aiding their positive post 16 progression such as the identified Year 9, 10 and 11 strategies and additional arrangements of work based learning [8.31] and suitable work placements [8.32].

SMART Targets and Aspirations

LAs use the information from Education, Health and Care assessments to "establish outcomes across education… based on the child or young person's needs and aspirations". [9.1]

[9.64] (EHCP) outcomes should always enable children and young people to move towards the long-term aspirations of employment or higher education…

[9.68] An outcome… might be for example, to make sufficient progress or achieve a qualification to enable him or her to attend a specific course at college… From Year 9 onwards, the nature of the outcomes will reflect the need to ensure young people are preparing for adulthood.

Education and training outcomes determine whether an EHCP plan is ceased for learners over the age of 18. Guidance states that the education and training EHCP outcomes should therefore be identified clearly [9.69] as are steps towards meeting the outcomes and arrangements for monitoring and reviewing.

The mandatory requirement to remain in contact with a red RONI with an EHCP until they have achieved their education and training outcomes should ensure that the red RONI remains in a positive destination at post 16. NEETs whose destinations are 'unknown' should become extinct as the EHCP remains in place until positive destinations are confirmed as per the agreed outcome review dates.

Personal Ownership

The EHCP remains with the learner until the age of 25, or until their education and training outcomes are achieved at 18. An opportunity to utilise a personal budget may further aid bespoke post 16 progression plans for a red RONI learner.

CONCLUSION

The Department for Education (2015, p.18 [2.18]) claimed that "the majority of children and young people with SEN will have their needs met through mainstream education providers and will not need Statements or EHCPs".

In response to this statement I would query:

(a) what constitutes a majority and how is this measured;

(b) why are increasing numbers of learners being educated externally to mainstream educational establishments;

(c) are the majority of children and young people that have applied for and been denied Statements or EHCPs also deemed to be having their needs met through mainstream providers;

(d) why are numbers of NEETs at post 16 increasing annually within the UK?

The SEND CoP clearly mandates [9.16] that "Local authorities **must not** apply a 'blanket' policy to particular groups of children or certain types of need". Red RONI learners would therefore not, be able to pre-qualify for an EHCP. In addition, "anyone can bring a child or young person who they believe has or probably has SEN or a disability to the attention of a local authority" (Section 24 of the Children and Families Act 2014).

Therefore, this assignment would need to ask an alternative question; *should learners who are qualitatively identified as being at a high risk of becoming NEET qualify as having SEN, in order ensure access to additional statutory support in progressing positively at Post-16*?

Next Steps

A joint Ofsted and Care Quality Commission consultation seeking views of how future inspections for 'how effectively local areas fulfill their responsibilities towards SEN children' is due to close early 2016. The consultation offers four proposals for the key evaluations that would be made by inspectors. Of particular interest to this assignment is proposal 2 (Ofsted and Care Quality Commission 2015, p.10) [28];

> This evaluation included children and young people's progress towards their next stage of education or employment… The Code of Practice identifies that, with high aspirations and the right support, the vast majority of children and young people can go on to achieve successful long-term outcomes in adult life.

and further [31];

> The range of ways by which the area is meeting children and young peoples' needs will be considered, including the effectiveness of early intervention.

This assignment will be submitted to the consultation in order for views to be recorded.

APPENDICES

(i)   SEND Code Of Practice: Specific References to Post 16 Progression:

[1.9] (Must) …from Year 9 onwards, particularly for those with EHCPs, LAs, schools, colleges and other agencies will be involved in the planning for their transition to adult life;

[3.31] (Deciding on shared outcomes:) Local partners should identify the outcomes that matter to children and young people with SEN… **Strategic outcomes:** for example, there has been a 10% increase in young people supported into employment…

[4.46] The Local Offer **must** identify training opportunities, supported employment services, apprenticeships, traineeships, supported internships and support available from supported employment services available to young people in the area to provide smooth transition from education and training into employment;

[4.52] (The Local Offer) **must** include information about preparing for and finding employment;

[4.53] (which) *should* include information about:

- Pathways to employment such as apprenticeships, traineeships and supported internships and how to apply for them

- Support available from Year 8 to help children and young people plan their careers, including signposting to where they can obtain information and advice about setting up their own enterprise

[8.21] As children approach the transition point, schools and colleges should help children and their families with more detailed planning. E.g. in Year 9, they

should aim to help children explore their aspirations… FE colleges and sixth forms can now recruit students directly from 14… In Year 10 they should aim to support the child and their family to explore more specific courses or places to study… In Year 11 they should aim to support the child and their family to firm up their plans for the post-16 options and familiarize themselves with the expected new setting;

[8.27] *(All) maintained schools and pupil referral units have a statutory duty under section 42A of the Education Act 1997 to ensure pupils from Year 8 until Year 13 are provided with independent careers guidance;*

[8.32] One of the most effective ways to prepare young people with SEN for employment is to arrange work-based learning;

[8.33] When considering a work placement… schools or colleges should match students carefully… (with) a thorough understanding of the student's potential, abilities, interests and areas they want to develop;

[8.37] Education and training… can also include support to students who may want to be self-employed, such as setting up a micro-enterprise;

[9.64] (EHCP) outcomes should always enable children and young people to move towards the long-term aspirations of employment or higher education…

[9.68] An outcome… might be for example, to make sufficient progress or achieve a qualification to enable him or her to attend a specific course at college… From Year 9 onwards, the nature of the outcomes will reflect the need to ensure young people are preparing for adulthood.

(ii)   Table E: One Local Authority Sub-Region: Performance Data 2013/14

SCHOOL	KS4 ^LOW ATTAINERS	KS4 STATE/ SA+	PERSISTENT ABSENCE	2014/15 FIXED TERM EXCLUSIONS	*DISAD-VANTAGED	DESTINATION NOT SUSTAINED	DESTINATION NOT CAPTURED
A	12% 20	9.7% (16/165)	4.1% (31/762)	23	19% (31)	9% (**13**)	3% (**4**)
C	28% 24	25% (26/104)	3% (18/591)	24	46% (48)	9% (**8**)	0
K	6% 16	19.2% (52/271)	5.9% (104/1762)	11	9% (24)	3% (**8**)	0
M	9% 22	5% (14/258)	5.7% (93/1635)	65	16% (41)	7% (**19**)	2% (**5**)
N	10% 15	16% (26/152)	4.1% (50/1211)	33	21% (33)	5% (**8.5**)	3% (**5**)
S	8% 17	16.6% (34/205)	2.5% (34/1370)	16	10% (21)	4% (**9**)	2% (**5**)
T	10% 21	10.2% (21/206)	7.2% (65/909)	104	18% (36)	5% (**9**)	4% (**6**)
TOTALS	**135**	**189**	**395**	**276**	**234**	**74 + 70 = 144**	
NATIONAL		All pupils: 10.7%	5.3%	-	-	7%	4%

^ Low Attainers = below expected level 4 at the end of Key Stage 2
* Disadvantaged = eligible for FSM in the last six years; Looked after continuously for 1 day or more; Adopted from care

Sources: Ofsted Performance Tables, Data Dashboard, Individual School Exclusion Data

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department for Education (2015) *Mental health and behaviour in schools Departmental advice for school staff*: DFE-00435-2014

Department for Education (2015) *Permanent and fixed-period exclusions in England*: SFR 27/2015

Department for Education (2015) *Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0-25 years:* DFE-00205-2013

Department for Education (2015) *Special Educational Needs in English Mainstream Schools*: SFR 25/2015

Department for Education (2015) *Key Stage 4: national and local authority tables (including characteristics. Destinations of KS4 and KS5 pupils, 2013 to 2014 (provisional):* SFR 40/2015

Department for Education (2011) *Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability A consultation* London: TSO (The Stationery Office)

Department for Education and Skills (2001) *Special Educational Needs Code of Practice*: DfES/581/2001

Cheminas, R (2015) *Special Educational Needs for Qualified and Trainee Teachers A practical guide to the new changes* (3rd ed) Oxon: Routledge

Ekins, A (2012) *The Changing Face of Special Educational Needs* Oxon: Routledge

Filmer-Sankey, C. and McCrone, T. (2012) *Developing Indicators for Early Identification of Young People at Risk of Temporary Disconnection from Learning* (LGA Research Assignment). Slough: NFER

Gross, J (2015) *Beating Bureaucracy in Special Educational Needs* (3rd ed) Oxon: Routledge

Maguire, S (2015) *NEET, unemployed, inactive or unknown – why does it matter?* Educational Research 57:2, 121-132, DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2015.1030850

Maguire, S. and Newton, B. (2013) *Research into the Phase 4 Locally-Led Delivery Projects for Raising the Participation Age: Research Report* Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies

Nettleton, M. and Friel, J. (2015) *Special Needs and Legal Entitlement* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Norwich, B. and Eaton, A. (2015) *The new special educational needs (SEN) legislation in England and implications for services for children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 20:2, 117-132, DOI: 10.1080/13632752.2014.989056

Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission (2015) *Local area SEND consultation* Reference no: 150134

One Local Authority (2009) *School Exclusion Data* (anonymous)

Parliament of the United Kingdom (2014) *The Children and Families Act 2014* London: Crown Copyright

Parliament of the United Kingdom (2010) *The Equality Act 2010* London: Crown Copyright

Thompson, S (2015) *Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) overview June 2015* Local Authority (anonymous)