CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

The State of SEN Statements

The Case for Specification & Quantification



Contents

Introduction	02
The Issue: Current Practice	07
Did You Know? The Legal Context	10
Child Rights Context	15
What is Needed	17
Gase Studies	19

Introduction

Children with Disabilities Strategic Alliance (CDSA) believes in an education system which addresses barriers to learning experienced by children and young people with a disability; delivers effective special educational needs provision and values children, young people and their parents as partners with schools and education authorities in achieving the best educational outcomes for each child with a disability and/or special educational needs.

"He is just a different child, so happy, enjoying school again" Parent comments after changes to Statement. CDSA has taken a particular interest in the Department of Education's Review of SEN and Inclusion, having produced an Education Manifesto and met with the Minister for Education, the Northern Ireland Assembly Education Committee, the Commissioner for Children and Young People in Northern Ireland, the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission to press the case for children with disabilities



and special educational needs (SEN). CDSA is concerned to ensure that children with disabilities and SEN in Northern Ireland can avail of the SEN support and services to which they are entitled.

In our experience CDSA members have dealt with thousands of parents across Northern Ireland who have concerns about the level and type of support available to children with disabilities and SEN.

This paper relates specifically to the needs of children with disabilities and SEN and the educational provision required to meet those needs as detailed in the Statement of Educational Need.

For parents of children with a disability and SEN, the approach to their child's first day at school is bound up with "My child is now happily attending school" Parent comments after changes to Statement.

more than the usual anticipation and excitement of new school bags, pencil cases and a school year full of possibilities. For many, there is also the additional concern about how the school will respond to the very particular needs of their child: will ramps allow access throughout the school, will the promised radio aids be available for their deaf child, will their child require one to one adult assistance, will the promised speech and language support

materialise or whether large text reading books will be available.

Many of those parents will discover for the first time that their children's Statement is essential to ensure that services to support their child are provided, and that the key to the Statement is that the specification and quantification of the support is written into Part 3.

The principal reason for the production of this report is CDSA's recognition that the statutory process for identification, assessment and provision of services for children with disability and SEN is becoming increasingly operationally deficient,

primarily as a result of a systematic failure to specify and quantify provision in Statements.

The result of this process is that parents cannot tell what their child should be receiving and Statements are not achieving the statutory purpose for which they are intended.

CDSA continues to recognise the importance of specification

"This Statement was achieved after a long struggle, couldn't have done it without your support" Parent comments to SENAC.



1 Statistics from the Children's Law Centre CHALKY Line. Total number of SEN enquiries over the past 5 year period: 2009 = 217, 2010 = 241, 2011 = 327, 2112 = 359, 2013 = 384 Note: The statistics for each year are calculated from January to December inclusive. There is increasing service demand year on year and this is predicted to continue into 2014.

and quantification of the support services which the child is to receive in Part 3 of the Statement as being core to guaranteeing the provision of SEN services. It is a matter of considerable concern that imprecise and ambiguous wording in Statements has become the norm over the past number of years to the degree that there is systematic failure to specify and quantify provision. Every stage in the statutory process which results in the production of a Statement, from the request for statutory assessment to the decision to make a Statement and the drafting and finalisation of the wording of that Statement has also become less transparent and more bureaucratic, often resulting

in delay with some parents having to resort to one or more sets of formal legal proceedings to ensure legal compliance with and protection of children's rights.

Members of CDSA have a unique perspective in relation to the writing of Statements across all Education & Library Board (ELB) areas, having been involved with supporting many parents over the last number of years.¹

Experience of engagement with parents and ELBs, suggests that draft Statements now rarely include sufficiently detailed specification or quantification of services, and, without support, parents may risk agreeing to a legally unenforceable document

which does not provide any meaningful practical support for their child. There are often substantial improvements to the wording of Statements, including specification and quantification of provision following intervention, in many cases completely changing the shape of services provided for the individual child.

CDSA, as a consequence of this recognition, decided to pull together case studies of Statements that were seen to change between the Draft Statement and the Final Statement, or Final Statements that changed as a result of Annual Review or the commencement of a legal challenge by way of appeal to the Special Educational **Needs and Disability Tribunal** (SENDIST). The case studies are an indication of the impact that quantification and specification have on the range of services provided to children with disabilities and SEN. However, they also clearly demonstrate the importance of the Statement in terms of upholding the legal rights of the child and providing access to appeal rights and legally enforceable remedies for parents who are unhappy with the provision offered to their child.



The Issue: Current Practice

The legal entitlement to the education provision set out within a Statement provides an incomparable opportunity to put in place the resources, interventions and specialist support that would not be available to the child without a Statement.

"...our main concern is everything in the Statement is very general and open ended, this concerns us as this is a pivotal opportunity to get the core help that can deliver for my child" Parent.

The Statement is drawn up following a rigorous statutory assessment process which identifies in detail the individual needs of the child. This process is currently completed within 18 weeks and the draft Statement should be informed by the content and detail of all of the reports compiled by the relevant professionals involved with the child.

The comprehensive nature of this statutory process is to ensure that the content of the Statement is accurate, detailed,

reflective of individual need and can therefore be implemented effectively by the relevant duty bearers. Each Statement sets out a child's special educational needs, objectives for learning, the provision required to meet those needs and enable learning. It also sets out for many children the means to support their inclusion in education.

The Statement is a strong statutory tool to provide education entitlement and mitigate the challenges and barriers to education faced by children with disabilities and SEN.

In our experience, when drafting Statements all 5 ELBs systematically fail to quantify

provision by using unclear, vague forms of wording. This practice has the effect of limiting or entirely negating the legal enforceability of Statements. This practice in very many cases equates to a failure to comply with Article 16 of the 1996 Order², which requires specification of educational provision in Part 3 of the Statement.

The most common practical example of failure to specify is that on the first draft of any Statement in any ELB where adult assistance is to be part of the provision, the wording will read: "access to a level of adult assistance determined by the Board..." Such wording is virtually meaningless in terms of setting out what a child is entitled to



2 In conjunction with Regulation 15 and Schedule 2 of the Education (Special Educational Needs) Regulations (NI) 2005. Schedule 2 sets out the form a statement should take. The first paragraph in a statement says that it is made "in accordance with Article 16". Part 3 of the statement should set out the particulars of the provision including for example that it should "in particular specify....staffing arrangements".

receive. This approach takes no account of the duty to determine individual need and does not comply with the norm of quantification. In contrast, the words "25 hours of 1-1 classroom assistance" do specify the type and quantity of provision that an individual child is entitled to. Being specific in describing provision on a Statement enables parents to understand what their child should be receiving, as well as being clear and legally enforceable if there is a failure to provide.3

"I received a statement today, I am so grateful for all your help I would not be in this position now if it wasn't for your help." Parent comments on help received from SENAC.

³ Morgan J (as he then was) in C, McD & McG at paragraph 18 of his judgment considers that "the statutory purpose of these provisions...is to ensure that parents in particular are able to determine whether the special educational provision required is in fact being delivered".



Did You Know? The Legal Context

When an ELB decides that a child requires a Statement of Special Educational Needs, it acquires legal responsibility for ensuring that the child receives the provision specified in the statement.

I've always gone to an ordinary school and I was doing really well until they took my physical help away at the beginning of P7. No-one was allowed to help me walk anymore and I ended up sitting in my wheelchair all day at school" Child.

Under Article 16(3)(b) of the Education (NI) Order 1996, the ELB has a particular statutory duty to "specify the special educational provision to be made" to meet the child's special educational needs. Paragraph 1.7 of the Code of Practice4 on the Identification and Assessment of Special **Educational Needs provides as** an "Essential Practice" that statements should be "clear and thorough". Paragraph 4.21 of the **Code of Practice** provides that statements should "normally be specific, detailed



4 'Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs' (Department of Education: Operative date 1st September 1998) at Para 4.21 and quantified (in terms for example of hours of ancillary or specialist teaching support)".

It is confirmed in the Code of Practice and has been well established in case law that outside the "normal" circumstances (which will require specification to include quantification) any flexibility in Part 3 of the Statement (Educational Provision) must be related to the individual needs of the child⁵.

It is also clear from the decision in **Bromley**⁶, that cases where the child's needs dictate that specification on a statement should not include quantification of the

hours of provision will be very exceptional in nature. It has been confirmed by the Minister of Education in answer to a written assembly question that "in a small number of cases flexibility in relation to quantification and specification is required".

Lady Justice Hale in the case of IPSEA –v- Secretary of State for Education and Skills⁸ stated that "the statement has to clearly spell out the provision appropriate to meet the particular needs of, and objectives identified for, the individual child. It must be addressed to the needs of the child rather than to the needs of the system....The Code requires precision as a general

5 C, McD & McG (Minors) [2008] NIQB 16; L-v- Clarke & Somerset County Council [1998] ELR 129; E –v- Newham London Borough Council & the SENT

6 London Borough of Bromley & SENT & Others [1999] ELR 260

7 AOW 19430/11-15

8 [2003] EWCA Civ 7 (approved by Morgan J, as he then was, in the case of C, McD & McG, cited above)



"I felt that no-one listened to me and that because I was only a child I was just stuck with what adults decided for me... now I know that my opinion does count after all." Child.

rule, but provides for flexibility where this will best meet the needs of the child...lt remains the case that vague statements which do not specify provision appropriate to the identified special educational needs of the child, will not comply with the law".

The ongoing systematic failure to properly specify educational provision hinders the ELBs in carrying out their statutory duties to identify, determine and make provision for children with special educational needs. This prevents children with special educational needs from accessing their legal entitlements and compromises the effectiveness of the Statement.

A lack of quantification can also undermine the protections and rights built into the SEN system for parents to be consulted and their right to appeal to the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal (SENDIST).

When 2 children within the same class have statements, even if they are for quite



different types of needs, it can be the practice of the ELBs that the classroom assistance hours are not quantified on each of the children's statements. Instead the ELB may provide a package of classroom assistance to the school with a direction that the school use the package for both children, regardless of how incompatible the two children's demands may be. The school is then left to determine how the classroom assistance will be applied for each child. We consider that this practice is inconsistent with a basic requirement underlying the SEN system, namely that 'special educational provision' should be tailor-made by the responsible Board to meet each child's needs as identified through the Board's statutory assessment.

It is the ELB's responsibility to determine the type and level of provision required for each individual child. and once this is established any change in provision for that individual child should be made compliantly with all the safeguards built into the legislation, regulations and Departmental guidance. Where unspecified 'packages' are put in place by the ELBs the risk is that such 'packages' of support may be reduced or removed without notice, and therefore without triggering the normal consultation and appeal rights which the system confers on the child's parents. We fundamentally object to this practice.

We also consider it to be an act of good faith for the Department to insist on specification and quantification of children's provision to ensure that the special educational needs support required to meet each child's needs is secured and parental rights to effective consultation and access to their appeal rights as intended by statute are provided for.

"There was a lot of hard work and effort by lots of people... legal stuff, lots of letters and meetings and a Tribunal. We even thought we'd have to go to court, but thankfully it's all been sorted out". Child.



Child Rights Context

Government is obliged to ensure that children with disabilities and SEN have access to their human rights (including education) on an equal basis to other children, under Article 7 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). Under Article 24(2) in realising this right, States Parties shall ensure that:

- a. Persons with disabilities
 are not excluded from
 the general education
 system on the basis
 of disability, and that
 children with disabilities
 are not excluded from free
 and compulsory primary
 education, or from
 secondary education, on
 the basis of disability;
- Persons with disabilities can access an inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary

- education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live;
- Reasonable accommodation of the individual's requirements is provided;
- d. Persons with disabilities receive the support required, within the general education system, to facilitate their effective education;



e. Effective individualized support measures are provided in environments that maximize academic and social development, consistent with the goal of full inclusion.

In particular, under the UNCRPD, it is clear that legal obligations towards children with a disability extend to education in the widest sense to ensure that they can attain full inclusion, participation and integration within the general education system and within society in a manner

which enables children to reach their full potential.

The case studies that follow demonstrate that a specific, quantified Statement enables many children with disabilities and SEN to successfully attend school and to experience greater inclusion and participation in school activities as they are guaranteed the level and type of provision necessary to meet their individual needs and to facilitate their inclusion within the school community.



What is Needed

Fundamentally, a Statement of SEN is about individual need and creating the conditions and support for learning for the individual child within their school alongside ensuring that the child can be included in all aspects of school life. Effective use of support across the whole class or school is not the purpose of a Statement. Our experience of working with families and children with disabilities and SEN over many years has confirmed to us that a Statement which contains specified and quantified provision is both effective and enforceable, strengthening a child's legal right to an effective education.

CDSA seeks assurance that the legislation and the Code of Practice governing the new framework shall be accompanied by statutory guidance which reinforces the duty to specify and quantify provision. Education authorities should be directed to adhere to legislation and guidance, including the drafting of specified and quantified Statements as part

of the normal operation of the SEN system, without being requested or challenged to do so. There should be no attempt to dilute or remove the requirement to specify and quantify in the revised Code of Practice.

CDSA calls upon the
Department of Education to
issue legislation and a revised
Code of Practice
which ensures:

- Education and Library Boards' compliance with the statutory duty to specify educational provision to be made in order to meet the child's special educational needs.⁹
- A change in current practice to ensure Education and Library Boards' compliance with the requirement in the Code of Practice that Statements should normally be specific, detailed and quantified.
- 3) Only in exceptional circumstances and in order to meet the particular needs of an individual child, should flexibility of provision contained within a Statement be justified.
- 4) The retention of a mandatory mechanism for annual review of statements which is legally enforceable by parents and children. ¹⁰
- 5) Strengthening of the legal duty¹¹ and accountability of school managers to make available appropriate educational provision for children with disabilities and SEN.



9 Article 16(3)(b) Education (NI) Order 1996

10 Article 19 Education (NI) Order 1996; Regulations 18, 19 & 20 of the Education (Special Educational Needs) Regulations (NI) 2005

11 Article 8 Education (NI) Order 1996

Case Studies

The case studies which follow contain examples of the initial vague wording of provision contained within Statements and crucially the modification of terminology to the Statement to include specification and quantification following intervention and challenge from our advisors and advocates on a child's behalf.

Supporting children with disabilities and SEN to receive legally compliant Statements, setting out the specific provision to which they are entitled, is one of the core demands of our member organisations. In almost all cases where specification and quantification are requested from the ELBs, changes are made to the Statement. Improving Statements in this way complies with children's legal rights under the statutory system; it also strengthens the enforceability of the Statement and guarantees the individual provision that enables equality of opportunity for a child to meet their full potential.

ORGANISATION: Children's Law Centre

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Final

DISABILITY TYPE: Rare Genetic Syndrome, Global Delay

& Epilepsy

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification/

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a 4 year old child who required significant therapeutic input to enable her to access education. Therapies were being reduced at her special school impacting on the quality of educational provision. Statutory reassessment was refused.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

"Access to paramedical therapy as an integral part of the curriculum"

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

The child's health deteriorated and her life was put at risk through lack of regular therapeutic input so that she was unable to participate in school or to properly access suitable education when well enough to attend school.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Blocks of occupational therapy in school with weekly review of seating and other needs; 30 minutes of direct speech and language therapy in school each week; 3 sessions of up to 20 minutes per week of land based physiotherapy; 1 session per week of hydrotherapy



ORGANISATION: Children's Law Centre

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Final

DISABILITY TYPE: Cerebral Palsy

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification/

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a nursery school child who was provided a full time classroom assistant for education purposes and to ensure physical safety. Another child in the class received a statement and the first child had to share his assistance, so that his provision was in fact reduced by 50% without notification to his parents. Neither child had quantified hours of classroom assistance.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

"Access to additional adult assistance determined by the Board..."

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

The child was unable to access the curriculum or to be included in activities without 1-1 assistance at all times. His health and safety was put at risk at times when he was unsupervised.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

"Full time 1-1 adult assistance"



Children's Law Centre **ORGANISATION:**

Final TYPE OF STATEMENT:

DISABILITY TYPE: Autism, Speech & Language Disorder

No Ouantification/ TYPE OF CASE STUDY:

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a GCSF student who had been out of school for a year due to a dispute around suitability of educational provision, including suitability of placement to meet complex special educational needs. The original statement was entirely inadequate and was very substantially amended over the course of protracted legal proceedings.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS OUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

"Access to teachers who understand the needs of pupils with an ASD" "Access to the Board's advisory service for ASD" "Access to a school environment that puts in place strategies..." No classroom assistance or therapeutic input was provided for whatsoever.



HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

The child was out of school for one year and was unable to access a suitably specialised educational placement to meet her very complex needs arising from autism.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Full time 1-1 classroom assistance; Speech and language therapy one hour per week; Occupational therapy to be provided in school and reviewed at least once per month; IEP with clear targets and set objectives so that progress is evidence based; 6 weekly multi-professional reviews; Part 4 was amended to provide a placement in a suitable special school.



ORGANISATION: Children's Law Centre

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Draft

DISABILITY TYPE: Autism, OCD & a Neurological Disorder

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification/

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a 16 year old boy who had been out of school for over a year and was coming to the end of compulsory education with no qualifications despite having ability to gain GCSEs. He was on Stage 3 throughout primary and secondary school and had numerous school placements. He was provided with no education whatsoever for well over one year despite entitlement to home tuition.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

"Access to additional assistance determined by the Board"; access to unnamed "programmes, activities, experiences" to enhance/ develop various named skills; "access to advisory support" from the ASD service. No other particular type of assistance specified and none of the provision was quantified.



HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

The child received no education for over a year. Education Welfare was involved but did not take any action. Home tuition was refused despite legal entitlement. The child's mental health, social development and educational attainments were negatively impacted.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

The statement was amended to include a relevant medical diagnosis; to highlight significant difficulty with written tasks and to provide for occupational therapy assessment and input in relation to handwriting, sensory processing and auditory processing issues. Part 3 included access to "assistive technology" and a scribe for all written tasks. Part 3 included "full time 1-1" classroom assistance. Part 4 was amended to provide a placement in a specialist ASD unit.

ORGANISATION: Children's Law Centre

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Final

DISABILITY TYPE: Cerebral Palsy

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification/

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a grammar school child with a physical disability who required physical help and physical activity, including physiotherapy, to ensure her ability to maintain posture and prevent discomfort so that she could maintain concentration, preserve mobility and to ensure inclusion and full participation at school. CLC represented the parents and child at a full hearing and a review hearing at SENDIST.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

Physiotherapy categorised as non-educational being placed in Parts 5 & 6. Trust Physiotherapist to visit school once, at the start of the school year.



NOTE: Amendments to the statement were agreed but outside that, three separate written agreements were required to secure the practical daily arrangements mentioned above which were not written into the statement.

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

The child's difficulties escalated to the point where she suffered pain and discomfort; she felt no one was listening to her and her grades fell significantly. She became acutely aware of her disability. After her educational provision was properly secured, her grades were significantly improved, in keeping with her academic ability and she was much better enabled to participate at school.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Part 3 of the statement (educational provision) was amended to include a "physical activity programme for one hour per day" at school. This included a floor exercise and stretching programme for two days per week; physiotherapy from a private physiotherapist in school on one day per week and swimming on the other two days of the week.



ORGANISATION: Children's Law Centre

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Final

DISABILITY TYPE: ASD, ADHD & Co-Morbid Mental

Health Difficulties

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification/

Change following challenge

CASE OUTLINE:

This case involved a primary school child with a very complex interaction of needs. Despite the support of his school and his own excellent academic potential he was struggling to cope with the mainstream environment. He was suffering extreme anxiety and distress resulting in escalating behavioural problems which impacted severely on access to the curriculum and on inclusion. ELB, HSCT and parental reports indicated the need for specific supports including full-time

assistance and supervision which the Board did not transpose into the statement.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

Insufficient specification and no quantification e.g. provision for "a level of adult assistance"



NOTE: On annual review the ELB, without justification, attempted to remove the quantification of classroom assistance. This was immediately reinstated when the parents challenged the ELB and threatened further legal action.

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:
The child's difficulties
escalated to the point where
he needed psychiatric care.
After his educational provision
was properly specified and
quantified, his situation
improved and he is now doing
very well at school.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

The addition of 25 hours classroom assistance per week from an assistant trained in ASD; 5 hours supervisory assistance; differentiated curriculum; Occupational Therapy moved out of Part 6 ("Non-Educational Provision") and specified/quantified as 1-1 sessions with review in "Educational Provision" in Part 3 of the statement; provision of an individualised sensory diet; redesign of the IEP.



ORGANISATION: SENAC

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Draft

DISABILITY TYPE: Downs Syndrome/Severe Speech

& Language Delay

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Child struggling to learn and progress, no focus or concentration, severe delay in speech and language and could not access the appropriate level of support.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

General reference of 'access to a more favourable pupil teacher ratio'.

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

Previously a place in a mainstream school was in jeopardy as due to the high level of assistance needed only special placement was offered.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Changed to include the specific reference to 25hrs classroom assistance and regular speech and language therapy.



ORGANISATION: SENAC

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Draft

DISABILITY TYPE: Autism, Range of complex needs

& severe emotional and social difficulties

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Child was out of school due to the nature of difficulties and lack of appropriate support. Statutory assessment had been refused but after intervention from SENAC a new request for statutory assessment was successful. It was evident to all involved that it was critical to receive a strong specific statement to enable the child to successfully return to school. Despite this the draft statement was issued without quantification.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

No quantification of access to adult assistance.

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

Child had been out of school due to complexity of behavioural and emotional issues and lack of appropriate support. Several incidents had increased the risk to the child's and other's safety at school. For the first time in months the child is now back in school and doing well.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Final statement included full time 1-1 classroom assistance.



ORGANISATION: SENAC

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Draft

DISABILITY TYPE: ADHD/Speech & Language Difficulties

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Child was not progressing due to her learning difficulties as a result of a complex interaction of needs and was assessed for a statement

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

No quantification of access to adult assistance.

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

Child had difficulty focusing on task and concentrating and was considerably behind peers in learning, speech and language support was inconsistent. Following quantification of provision within the statement progress was evident.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Final statement was changed to 15 hours classroom assistance and speech and language support quantified.



ORGANISATION: National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS)

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Draft Primary

DISABILITY TYPE: Hearing Impairment & Additional Needs

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Worsening bi-lateral sensorineural hearing loss. Speech and language delay. [Health issue.]

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

Advice from the teacher of the deaf. Access to speech and language provision.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Addition of "dependent upon lip-reading".

Addition of [health issue].

Develop lip reading skills.

Advantaged seating position.

Feeling of security.

Classroom acoustically favourable.

Minimum of 12.5 hours classroom assistant.

5 hours supervisory assistance.

Minimum weekly Teacher of the Deaf sessions.

ORGANISATION: National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS)

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Final

DISABILITY TYPE: Hearing Impairment
TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Ouantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Moderate bi-lateral sensorineural hearing loss. Hearing aids, severe speech and language delay

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

No current Teacher of the Deaf provision was in evidence.
Access to specialist equipment.
Appropriate level of adult support. Advice and support from Teacher of the Deaf

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

Child was happy in school but parent concerned at the uncertain level of support that the child would receive, including the failure to specify speech and language support.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Amended following Parental request for Statutory
Assessment at Annual Review.

Addition to Teacher of the Deaf Advice.



Access to full time adult support throughout the day.

Teacher of the Deaf support time scale of provision and form of intervention detailed.

Individual structured speech and language programme included for the first time.



ORGANISATION: National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS)

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Primary Statement

DISABILITY TYPE: Hearing Impairment

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Bi-lateral Moderate / Severe hearing loss with conductive overlay. Hearing Aids and sign language, significantly delayed speech, expressive speech may be unintelligible to those unfamiliar.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

Opportunities to lip read and use sign where appropriate. Access to full time Adult support. Access to Teacher of the Deaf. Daily testing of audiological equipment.



HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:
Child and family using sign
language at home and
requested Sign Support at
school. Parents did not believe
that offer of Sign language
was sufficient. Also concerned
that Teacher of the Deaf hours
were not quantified. Parents
and child happy with the
decision once the statement
was changed.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Teacher of the Deaf hours were specified. Sign Language support for the child to be provided in the school, including level of sign language qualification.



ORGANISATION: National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS)

TYPE OF STATEMENT: Transfer to post primary

DISABILITY TYPE: Hearing Impairment

TYPE OF CASE STUDY: No Quantification

CASE OUTLINE:

Moderate bi-lateral sensorineural moderate to severe hearing loss. Hearing aids, radio aids.

HOW THE STATEMENT WAS QUANTIFIED AND SPECIFIED IN FIRST INSTANCE:

Provision of funding at level to be agreed by the board. Consider ceasing statement at first annual review

HOW THE CHILD WAS AFFECTED:

Parents concerned at the absence of quantification and specification to the statement over several drafts during preparation. Concerned that previous support would disappear on transfer, leaving the child to struggle at a new school.

DETAIL OF HOW THE STATEMENT WAS CHANGED:

Acoustically favourable environment. Access to radio aids. 15 hours classroom assistance. 5 hours supervision assistance. Teacher of the deaf - one session weekly.



Notes



Notes



THE FOLLOWING ORGANISATIONS SUPPORT THIS CALL:











































FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON CDSA PLEASE CONTACT:

Children in Northern Ireland, Unit 9, 40 Montgomery Road, Belfast, BT6 9HL

Find us on:

facebook.

Tel: 028 9040 1290 Email: info@ci-ni.org.uk Web: www.ci-ni.org.uk

Follow us on:

twitter

