

## Appendix 3: Options presented to the working group for staged implementation of new model for existing EHC Plans

- The group discussed their preferred approach for a staged roll-out for existing EHC Plans during the working group meeting on 06/09/2022.
  - Provided options are presented below with pros and cons for each option
  - All models are likely to result in simultaneous running of two systems at once (which may require increased capacity)
  - Approximate numbers of children/young people with EHCPs have been added to options where possible. These are based on filters within the council's Minimum Data Set as at 05/08/2022. Note that the year group is as at August 2022, and numbers will therefore be moved up a year group in September 2022.

Implementation Option	Pros	Cons
<p>a. implement for all EHC Plans in all schools in a geographic area (this could be according to SENCO clusters, SEND Team Locality areas, or another split)</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1633 EHCP (taken from MDS 05.08.22 filter – CEC/Mainstream/maintained/academy/free/year group reception to yr11)</li> </ul> <p>By Locality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Central (Congleton) = 470</li> <li>● South (Crewe and nantwich) = 568</li> <li>● North (KWP/Macclesfield) = 595</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consistency across whole of a school and geographic area – with all plans changing at same time</li> <li>● May help transition (if child goes to local school in same geographic area)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Would take much longer to implement for all EHC Plans (several years) if only targeting one geographic area at a time – some areas may have to wait for a significant period to see any changes (with risk of being viewed by parents/carers as having inequity due to different systems across CE – with areas perhaps being seen to be treated more favourably or penalised)</li> <li>● Capacity may be an issue if we chose to do all EHC Plans in one area in a very short period of time</li> <li>● If Annual Reviews not used, would mean changing plans twice in one year</li> </ul>
<p>b. implement in secondary schools first, then primary schools (or vice versa)</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Secondary = 602</li> <li>● Primary = 1031</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consistency across all schools in one age bracket – could lead to primaries sharing best practice between one another (same for secondaries)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● May take longer to implement for all EHC Plans, with one group of schools (primary or secondary) having to wait longer for change</li> <li>● May cause issues for transition cases</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity may be an issue if we chose to do all EHC Plans in all secondaries or all primaries in a very short period of time</li> <li>If Annual Reviews not used, would mean changing plans twice in one year</li> </ul>
<p>c. implement in individual schools one at a time (school by school), moving through schools alphabetically or by number of EHC Plans</p> <p>[Numbers not provided at this stage as would form a very long list]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency for single school – all pupils with EHC Plans on same model at one time. Allows flexibility across whole school provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May take longer to implement for all EHC Plans – potential inequity with some schools likely to wait a long time</li> <li>Miss benefits around transition or peer-sharing (though school that has just transitioned could mentor next school in list)</li> </ul>
<p>d. implement by year groups across all schools</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reception = 111</li> <li>Year 1 = 126</li> <li>Year 2 = 128</li> <li>Year 3 = 142</li> <li>Year 4 = 176</li> <li>Year 5 = 172</li> <li>Year 6 = 176</li> <li>Year 7 = 146</li> <li>Year 8 = 146</li> <li>Year 9 = 136</li> <li>Year 10 = 125</li> <li>Year 11 = 124</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiar approach as used for transition from statements to EHC Plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would take much longer to implement for all EHC Plans (several years) if only targeting specific year groups each academic year</li> <li>Could cause issues for small number of very small schools where classes are mixed year groups</li> </ul>
<p>e. implement according to Annual Review dates across all schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EHC Plans only need to be amended once – more efficient as fewer changes for schools and families to review, plus less work for SEND team and fewer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current issues with timeliness and capacity of Annual Review processes, including issuing of amended plans after a review - may require more capacity in SEND team?</li> </ul>

<p>[Numbers not provided at this stage as would form a very long list]</p>	<p>opportunities to appeal (which can also require increased capacity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to change all EHC Plans to new system in space of one calendar year</li> </ul>	
<p>f. target transition groups first (those moving from early years to primary, primary to secondary, secondary to post-16 etc.)</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nursery 2 = 37 (please note: not included in 1633)</li> <li>• Year 6 = 176</li> <li>• Year 11 = 124</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EHC Plans need to be amended at transition points – so increased efficiency making multiple changes at once.</li> <li>• Would mean all in one year group would be transitioned to new model, which would then move through schools (new pupils on new model)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would take much longer to implement for all EHC Plans (several years) if only targeting transition groups each academic year</li> </ul>
<p>g. Include in any natural changes to an EHC Plan (e.g. interim review, change of placement) as an addition</p> <p>[Numbers not provided]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EHC Plans need to be amended due to other change – so increased efficiency making multiple changes at once.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May require additional capacity?</li> <li>• Potential for confusion if outside other agreed plan</li> </ul>
<p>h. a combination of the above suggestions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be quicker if combining methods, and allow us to pick more favourable parts</li> </ul>	