

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"> ● 1633 EHCP (taken from MDS 05.08.22 filter – CEC/Mainstream/maintained/academy/free/year group reception to yr11) <p>By Locality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central (Congleton) = 470 ● South (Crewe and nantwich) = 568 ● North (KWP/Macclesfield) = 595 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consistency across whole of a school and geographic area – with all plans changing at same time ● May help transition (if child goes to local school in same geographic area) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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) ● Capacity may be an issue if we chose to do all EHC Plans in one area in a very short period of time ● If Annual Reviews not used, would mean changing plans twice in one year
<p>b. implement in secondary schools first, then primary schools (or vice versa)</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Secondary = 602 ● Primary = 1031 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consistency across all schools in one age bracket – could lead to primaries sharing best practice between one another (same for secondaries) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● May take longer to implement for all EHC Plans, with one group of schools (primary or secondary) having to wait longer for change ● May cause issues for transition cases

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 If Annual Reviews not used, would mean changing plans twice in one year
<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"> Consistency for single school – all pupils with EHC Plans on same model at one time. Allows flexibility across whole school provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May take longer to implement for all EHC Plans – potential inequity with some schools likely to wait a long time Miss benefits around transition or peer-sharing (though school that has just transitioned could mentor next school in list)
<p>d. implement by year groups across all schools</p> <p>Numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reception = 111 Year 1 = 126 Year 2 = 128 Year 3 = 142 Year 4 = 176 Year 5 = 172 Year 6 = 176 Year 7 = 146 Year 8 = 146 Year 9 = 136 Year 10 = 125 Year 11 = 124 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Familiar approach as used for transition from statements to EHC Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would take much longer to implement for all EHC Plans (several years) if only targeting specific year groups each academic year Could cause issues for small number of very small schools where classes are mixed year groups
<p>e. implement according to Annual Review dates across all schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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?

<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"> • Potential to change all EHC Plans to new system in space of one calendar year 	
<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"> • Nursery 2 = 37 (please note: not included in 1633) • Year 6 = 176 • Year 11 = 124 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHC Plans need to be amended at transition points – so increased efficiency making multiple changes at once. • Would mean all in one year group would be transitioned to new model, which would then move through schools (new pupils on new model) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would take much longer to implement for all EHC Plans (several years) if only targeting transition groups each academic year
<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"> • EHC Plans need to be amended due to other change – so increased efficiency making multiple changes at once. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May require additional capacity? • Potential for confusion if outside other agreed plan
<p>h. a combination of the above suggestions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be quicker if combining methods, and allow us to pick more favourable parts 	