



Interchange

67

Raising Attainment of Pupils with Special Educational Needs



Why **Interchange**?

Research cannot make the decisions for policy makers and others concerned with improving the quality of education in our schools and colleges. Nor can it by itself bring about change. However, it can create a better basis for decisions, by providing information and explanation about educational practice and by clarifying and challenging ideas and assumptions.

It is important that every opportunity should be taken to communicate research findings, both inside and outside the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED). Moreover, if research is to have the greatest possible impact on policy and practice, the findings need to be presented in an accessible, interesting and attractive form to policy makers, teachers, lecturers, parents and employers.

Interchange aims to further improve the Education Department Research Unit's dissemination of the findings of research funded by SEED. We hope you will find that **Interchange** is long enough to give the flavour of the complexities, subtleties and limitations of a research study but concise enough to give a good feeling for the findings and in some cases to encourage you to obtain the full report.

The views expressed in this **Interchange** are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Executive or any other organisation(s) by whom the author(s) is/are employed.

Copyright © July 2001, Scottish Executive Education Department
ISSN 0969-613X

Interchange may be photocopied for use within your own institution.

A limited number of additional copies can be obtained by writing to the SEED Research Unit Dissemination Officer at the Scottish Executive Education Department, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ. File copies for electronic downloading are available on the the Scottish Executive server (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/edru.asp>).

Raising Attainment of Pupils with Special Educational Needs

Sheila Riddell, Pauline Banks, Alastair Wilson (Strathclyde Centre for Disability Research, University of Glasgow); Jean Kane (Faculty of Education, University of Glasgow); Anne Baynes, Alan Dyson, Alan Millward (Special Educational Needs Research Centre, University of Newcastle)

Introduction

The Scottish Executive has identified raising standards through target setting as a major initiative. Following the framework set out in the paper *Setting Standards – Raising Standards in Schools* (SOED, 1998a), it was decided to set targets for schools in relation to the 5-14 programme and SQA awards, and in 1998 support packs were produced for primary and secondary schools. In line with the Scottish Executive's social inclusion agenda, it was decided to include children with special educational needs (SEN) in the target-setting initiative and the paper *Raising Standards: Setting Targets for Pupils with Special Educational Needs* (SOEID, 1999) described how this was to be done. In November 1999, a support pack in relation to special educational needs was produced and circulated to all schools (*Raising Standards – Setting Targets Support Pack: Special Educational Needs*, SEED, 1999).

The support pack suggested that Individualised Educational Programmes (IEP) should be opened for all children in special schools and units and all children with Records of Needs (RoN) in mainstream schools. In addition, children in mainstream schools who do not have RoNs but require 'significant planned intervention' should have IEPs with targets.

Targets should be set in one or more of the following curriculum areas: communication and language, numeracy, personal and social development. Subject departments in secondary schools should only be involved in planning the IEP and inserting targets if these contributed significantly to meeting the pupils' special educational needs.

The number of long-term targets, to be achieved during the course of a school session, could range from 1-2 targets within one area of the curriculum to 8-12 or more targets across three areas of the curriculum. The long-term targets for each pupil were to be broken down into about four short-term targets, each of which should be covered in 6-8 weeks.

In October each year, the progress of pupils in relation to the long-term targets should be reported to the Scottish Executive and the Education Authority, and new long-term targets set. Schools were given advice about how percentages of targets achieved were to be reported to their authorities.

The target-setting initiative was phased in, with only schools which considered they were ready being fully involved in the first phase, from April 1999 to the end of session 1999/2000. A number of schools involved in the

first phase from April 1999 set targets for 2000 and more schools joined in August 1999. All received support from national development officers. Schools not involved in the first phase were expected to use this time to consider the implications of the initiative for their schools and to plan and implement any required action through their 1999-2000 development plan. From April 2000, all schools were expected to collate information derived from pupil reviews and individual planning meetings in order to develop statements of long-term targets with appropriate success criteria. By August 2000, all schools should have been working towards agreed targets and have systems in place to track progress. However, when our study took place mainstream schools, most of which had not participated in the pilot phase one, were generally much further behind in introducing IEPs with targets than special schools and units.

During the course of this study a national staff development initiative 'Success for All' was implemented to provide advice to schools and education authorities on the effective use of IEPs. Some of the issues raised in this study are being progressed through this initiative.

Research aims

The Scottish Executive Education Department identified four aims which it wished the research to address. Each aim implied a number of research questions which are set out below.

Research Aim 1: *To identify examples of the effective use of IEPs in both special schools and units*

Research questions:

- how widely are IEPs currently being used in mainstream and special settings?
- what sorts of IEPs (as indicated on the dimensions set out above) are currently in use
- how do these uses vary in accordance with different 'types' of SEN and different school contexts?
- what rationales are offered by teachers and other stakeholders for the use of IEPs in general and for variations of IEPs types in particular?
- how fully are IEPs implemented in different settings and what facilitates or inhibits their implementation?
- what sorts of effects do IEPs have on pedagogy and curriculum in different contexts?
- what level of satisfaction do different stakeholders express?
- what evidence is there of the effectiveness of IEPs as a whole and different 'types' of IEPs in particular in raising pupil attainment?

Research aim 2: *To compare this with the use of IEPs with a small sample of children with special educational needs in mainstream education.*

Research questions:

- how widely are IEPs currently being used for children with RoNs and with SEN but no Records in mainstream settings?
- how do they differ from IEPs in special settings?
- how are decisions made about who will or will not have an IEP?
- how are IEPs related to other forms of planning and target setting in mainstream schools?

Research aim 3: *To explore the relationship between IEPs and raising attainment.*

Research questions:

- in what ways do schools link their use of IEPs to their wider strategies for raising pupil attainment?
- what evidence is there that schools which use IEPs in a coherent manner also generate higher attainments amongst their pupils?
- is there any evidence that certain types and uses of IEPs might detract from pupil attainment (eg by increasing the bureaucratic burden on teachers or by lowering expectations)?
- to what extent may IEPs provide the basis for benchmarks which may be used to compare the effectiveness of particular schools and sectors for children with similar 'types' of SEN?

Research aim 4: *To make recommendations for the effective use of IEPs.*

Research questions:

- what are the perceptions of a range of stakeholders (Scottish Executive, local authorities, schools, parents) about the purpose of IEPs? Is there a consensus view or do different groups regard IEPs as serving different functions?
- in the light of perceptions of the purpose(s) of IEPs and current uses, what are the areas in which guidance is needed e.g. in relation to IEP focus and format, pupil involvement, potential for comparability and benchmarking, use of IEPs in mainstream settings?
- in their present format, can IEPs be used to assess the delivery of best value in provision for children with special educational needs and to monitor efforts to raise standards? If not, and this is considered to be a worthwhile objective, then what changes are needed?

- what recommendations might be made about the format and content of the parallel project currently under way to produce staff development materials on IEPs?

Methodology

Part 1 Literature review

A review of the literature on IEPs was undertaken, focusing on the UK, but also incorporating relevant literature from other countries where IEPs have been established.

Part 2 Key informant interviews

Seventeen interviews were undertaken with key personnel to gather information about policy and practice at national, education authority and school levels. These included representatives from: HMI, SOEID, local authorities and schools. The purpose of these interviews was primarily to sensitise the research team to issues regarding IEPs prior to embarking on the major fieldwork phase of the study.

Part 3 Questionnaire survey

To investigate policy and practice further, two questionnaires were constructed, one for completion by special schools and units, a second for completion by mainstream schools. Questionnaires were sent out to all special schools and units in Scotland (n=224) and all secondary schools and a proportion of primary schools in four education authorities (n=206), North Ayrshire, North Lanarkshire, City of Dundee, and Scottish Borders (see table 1). Three reminders were sent at intervals. Overall, a 65% response rate was achieved.

Table 1: *Questionnaires sent out, number returned, and percentage response rate*

Type of School/unit	Number of questionnaires sent	Completed questionnaires received	% response rate
Special	224	141	62.9
Mainstream	206	137	66.5
Total	430	278	64.7

Part 4 Pupil case studies

Schools were identified where there was evidence that IEPs were formulated and used with clarity, thoroughness and coherence. Ten schools in four authorities were selected and within each school four pupils were identified as case studies. Thirty eight case studies were completed. Table 2 summarises their difficulties and location.

Table 2 Location and difficulties of case study pupils

Location	Nature of difficulty						
	Moderate Learning Difficulties	Social Emotional Behavioural Difficulties	Physical/Sensory Impairment	Language/Comm Difficulties	Specific Learning Difficulties	Severe/Profound Learning Difficulties	Complex Learning Difficulties/Multiple Impairments
Special School	3	2	0	0	0	5	1
Special Unit	7	1	0	2	2	5	1
Mainstream	1	3	4	0	1	0	0

Note: Half of the pupils were in P4 and half in S2

In addition to observation, interviews were conducted with key professionals, the parents and, where possible, the child to elicit information on the processes of IEP formulation, monitoring and review and the collation and reporting of targets.

Summary of findings

The literature review, covering UK, European and US sources, identified pedagogical and policy influences on the development of IEPs and noted issues affecting their implementation. Broad influences included the following:

- The impact of behavioural psychology on the field of SEN, with a focus on learning objectives
- Moves towards curriculum regulation
- A new emphasis on accountability and audit
- Parental rights and the advent of consumerism in public services.

Practical issues in the implementation of IEPs included the following:

- Debates over appropriate format and the extent of prescription
- The extent to which IEPs should dictate curriculum and pedagogy at the expense of teacher discretion
- Specific issues in implementing IEPs in special, mainstream, primary and secondary settings, in particular the role of subject specialists and dedicated SEN staff
- The use of targets as a means of audit and the wider impact on teaching and learning
- Difficulties in working with multi-disciplinary teams, parents and pupils

In the European literature, many countries share the same concerns with regard to IEP implementation. There are worries about the amount of time involved in developing and reviewing IEPs. In addition, there are fears that targets set within IEPs may lead to a narrowing of the curriculum. Teachers may focus on aspects of the curriculum which can be reduced to simple learning objectives,

ignoring those where it is more difficult to say whether the child can or cannot achieve them. There are also concerns about whether targets can capture the experience of children with autistic-spectrum disorder, whose ability to complete a task successfully may vary from day to day.

Under what circumstances do you think setting precise targets may narrow or broaden a child's learning experience?

What do you think might be the advantage of combining an IEP with a RoN, as in the USA?

In the USA, the functions of a RoN are combined with those of an IEP and since their inception in the 1970s, there has been a focus on accountability. However, even here there is little literature on links between setting targets and raising standards.

Key informant interviews were used to compare the perspectives of different interest groups and identified the following concerns and issues from a range of perspectives:

- Scottish Executive respondents had various views of IEPs. From an Audit Unit perspective, IEPs were seen as instruments to raise standards and audit outcomes. Resistance to the use of SMART targets and the accountability agenda was anticipated.
- A view from HMI was that IEPs should be used within a school improvement framework to focus and monitor the teaching of children with SEN.
- Headteachers and Education Authorities were concerned about issues of workload and wished for more precise guidance and training.
- There was uncertainty over the proportion and characteristics of pupils who should receive an IEP.
- A minority EA view was that IEPs might replace RoNs.
- IEPs were regarded as a useful management tool to raise standards, but the process of audit was seen as the responsibility of SEED.
- EAs had no plans to moderate targets or hold schools accountable on the basis of IEPs.
- Voluntary organisations were concerned about a potential narrowing of the curriculum and they wanted wider involvement of parents and children.

Is it possible or desirable to use IEPs as a means to check on the quality of teaching and learning of children with special educational needs? Are IEPs best used as part of a school improvement strategy with internal monitoring or should they be used for external monitoring?

The **questionnaire survey** was used to compare understandings of and responses to IEPs in mainstream and special school settings. Table 3 shows the number and percentage of pupils with RoNs and IEPs in different types of school. It also shows the percentage of pupils in different settings who might benefit from having an IEP, but who do not currently have one.

Table 3: Pupils with Records of Needs, special educational needs and IEPs in special and mainstream settings

	Special Schools			Mainstream Schools	
	Primary	Secondary	All through	Primary	Secondary
Number of schools that returned completed questionnaires	28	20	60	96	40
Mean number of pupils in school	36	57	60	208	840
Record of Needs (s101/m127)					
Number of schools that reported having no pupils with a RoN	1	2	0	27	0
Mean % of pupils with RoN	73.3%	61.0%	84.1%	1.0%	1.5%
SEN (s88/m117)					
Number of schools that reported having at least one pupil with sig. SEN but no RoN	13	16	49	75	35
Mean % of pupils with SEN but without a RoN	25.9%	27.2%	16.2%	6.1%	3.1%
IEP (s100/m129)					
Number of schools that reported having no IEPs	0	1	0	20	5
Mean % of pupils with an IEP	97.0%	80.8%	96.3%	4.3%	2.4%
Number of schools that reported having additional pupils who would <i>benefit</i> from having an IEP but do not currently have one. (s58/m75)	1	1	2	39	16
Mean % of pupils who would benefit from IEP, but do not currently have one	0.3%	5.2%	1.9%	2.2%	2.1%
Missing data: Percentage figures are percentage of schools that answered each question. These figures are shown in brackets, e.g. (s30/m30) indicates that 30 special and 30 mainstream schools answered this question.					

Table 3 shows that about a quarter of pupils in special schools do not have a RoN, which affects their legal right to multi-disciplinary assessment, regular review and particular routes of appeal. Whilst a high proportion of pupils in

primary and all through schools have IEPs, 20% of those in secondary special schools do not have an IEP and 40% do not have a RoN. Many of these pupils are likely to have social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. A lower proportion of pupils in mainstream primary schools have a RoN compared with mainstream secondary schools (1% c.f. 1.5%), but twice as many pupils in mainstream primary schools have IEPs (4.3% c.f. 2.4%). In many schools, respondents could identify pupils who would benefit from an IEP but did not have one.

Table 4 summarises information included in IEPs in different settings.

Table 4: *Information recorded on IEP in mainstream and special schools/units*

Information included in IEP form	Total % (n=74)	Mainstream		Special		
		Primary (n=18)	Secondary (n=10)	Primary (n=15)	Secondary (n=8)	All-through (n=23)
Personal details	98.6	18	10	15	7	23
Evaluation	95.9	17	10	13	8	23
Staff responsible for implementing IEP	87.8	16	10	14	7	18
Strategy	85.1	17	10	12	5	19
Long-term goals	81.0	12	8	12	8	20
Short-term goals	79.7	12	8	11	7	21
SEN	74.3	11	9	11	7	17
Key individuals involved in development of IEP	64.9	9	7	10	6	16
Resource implications	62.2	16	4	9	4	13
Aptitudes and abilities	52.7	8	5	11	3	12
Parents' input	32.4	3	4	6	2	9
Pupil's input	14.9	3	1	4	0	3

Table 4 shows that any parents' and pupils' input into an IEP is often not noted on the document. 62% of respondents said that resource implications were noted. However, on the IEPs we collected whilst conducting the case studies, it was clear that the resources related to school-based provision e.g. a particular type of teaching material. Input by classroom assistants or speech therapists was not recorded on IEPs, as recommended by Circular 4/96 (SOEID, 1996). Mainstream schools, in particular secondary schools, appeared most confused about the purpose of IEPs. They felt too little time was available to do them properly and that more support and training was needed. Findings from the questionnaire survey and from scrutinising IEPs are summarised below:

- There was confusion and inconsistency over which children should get an IEP. Some children in special settings had neither a RoN nor an IEP.

Why do you think a higher proportion of pupils in mainstream primary schools compared with mainstream secondary schools have IEPs?

Why do you think such a high proportion of pupils in secondary special schools lack an IEP? Do you think this group of pupils might benefit from an IEP?

- IEPs were sometimes used in place of RoN.
- Most IEPs did not involve a high degree of multi-disciplinary collaboration.
- Parents and pupils were not routinely involved in IEP production and review.
- Formats used within and between authorities varied greatly.
- There was a greater emphasis on IEP production than review and analysis.
- There was suspicion of the accountability agenda.
- Special schools and units were more likely than mainstream schools to set targets across the curriculum rather than in the three key areas only.
- Most schools had difficulty setting SMART targets for pupils with more intractable and complex difficulties, such as autistic spectrum disorder, attention deficit disorder and complex, profound or multiple difficulties.
- Setting SMART targets had significant additional time implications, but attracted no additional resources.
- Additional guidance and training was desired particularly in mainstream and non-pilot schools.
- Mainstream schools generally found the initiative more difficult to fit into existing practice than special schools and units.
- Schools participating in the pilot phase in both mainstream and special sectors were more positive about the initiative.

Two key messages from the questionnaire survey are the following:

- Most respondents believe IEPs are a useful means of focusing on the goals and achievements of pupils with SEN, but are more sceptical about the wider accountability agenda.
- Compared with mainstream schools, special schools and units generally have more positive attitudes towards, and appear to be coping better with, the target-setting initiative associated with IEPs. Mainstream schools with high levels of specialist support are also managing the initiative effectively.

Case studies were used to explore the use of IEPs in special schools and units and in a small sample of mainstream schools. Time was spent with the child in school in order to understand the educational context and interviews took place with all the key individuals involved in the construction and review of IEPs. The main findings were:

- IEPs were formatted in different ways, ranging from short, succinct documents to lengthy and expansive booklets. Some of the short IEPs, whilst being used effectively within their particular context, omitted vital information whilst the longer IEPs required a very significant time investment.

Why do you think mainstream schools, in particular those at secondary stage, have found the IEP initiative difficult to implement. Do these findings have implications for current moves towards the inclusion of children with SEN? What changes within the culture and organisation of secondary schools would make IEPs easier to manage?

Why do you think parents and (particularly) children were so little involved in the process of constructing and reviewing IEPs? What could be done to make IEPs more participative documents?

Is it appropriate that teachers control the development and review of IEPs? Should there be a more active role for other professionals (e.g. health, social work, speech therapy)? If so, how might this involvement be achieved?

- The highest degree of confidence and competence in implementing target setting was found in schools involved in the pilot project and in the central belt with greater access to national seminars.
- Schools did not believe that collating targets could or should be used to measure effectiveness.
- Multi-disciplinary input was relatively rare and tended to be restricted to professionals working with children on a day to day basis. Educational psychologists were usually only involved in the annual review of the RoN, where the IEP was also discussed. Health professionals had virtually no input into IEPs.
- Parents were generally not involved in IEP formulation and review. Parents felt schools could do more to explain the purpose of the documents.
- Only a small number of examples were found of active pupil input. Involving children with the most significant difficulties posed the most serious problems.

Research aims revisited

Research Aims 1 & 2: *To identify examples of the effective use of IEPs in both special schools and units and to compare with a small sample of mainstream schools*

- Examples of the effective use of IEPs in a special school, special unit and in mainstream primary and secondary schools were identified. Each example indicated where difficulties might arise in different settings.
- In the special school, the IEP was very detailed but extremely time consuming and questions were raised about its costs and benefits.
- In the special unit, the very brief IEP omitted information on methods and success criteria. Reviews of targets tended to use 'rule of thumb' judgements rather than hard measures.
- In the mainstream secondary school, there were some problems in managing liaison between SEN and mainstream staff.
- Parents of case study pupils were aware of their children's targets, but were not closely involved in formulation or review.
- Schools found it difficult to involve pupils in setting and reviewing academic targets, but often tried to involve them in identifying behavioural targets. The best example of engaging a pupil in setting and working towards an IEP target was in a mainstream primary school educating an able child with visual impairment.

Research aim 3: *To explore the relationship between IEPs and raising attainment.*

- There was no hard evidence that IEPs raise attainment but a different research design would be required to gather this. However, soft data suggested a generally optimistic view of the initiative despite the reservations indicated in earlier findings. A focus on the individual child

was welcomed, and it was assumed this would improve practice. Attempts to audit this improvement were treated with scepticism.

Research aim 4: *To make recommendations for the effective use of IEPs.*

- There is a need to provide clearer advice about which pupils should receive a RoN and an IEP. The absence of IEPs for a fifth of children in secondary special schools is particularly worrying. Clearer advice on which children in mainstream schools should receive IEPs is needed.

Key issues for discussion

Maintaining curriculum balance

One key issue to consider is the impact that IEPs might have on the curricular opportunities available to pupils. The dangers, as detailed in the literature, are that the introduction of IEPs will lead to teachers limiting their setting of targets to those areas of the curriculum which are most amenable to an ‘objectives approach’. Such a danger is likely to be increased if IEPs were to be used as the *only* means of achieving greater ‘accountability’ within provision for special educational needs. If the achievement of IEP targets was to be linked to overall school or individual teacher ‘effectiveness’ there is a risk that teachers will limit the type of targets that are included to those areas of the curriculum where there are more proven ‘technologies’ for delivering progress. This could conflict with the policy of greater ‘inclusion’ of pupils with special educational needs.

Useful checks and balances would be the following:

- Policy guidance on the areas of the curriculum in which targets were to be set
- The assessment of effectiveness being based on a range of indicators rather than relying solely on IEP targets
- A clear commitment from policy makers, regularly reinforced, on the need for a balanced curriculum
- Dissemination of ‘good practice’ in the writing of IEPs to support those institutions and individuals who were experiencing difficulties in writing appropriate IEPs.

Achieving consistency whilst avoiding over prescription

A second key issue is a danger that unless the requirement to write IEPs is reinforced through guidance or statute there may well be a lack of consistency in their production and implementation. There is a dilemma in creating the right balance between achieving, at least in the initial stages of implementation, a level of consistency through prescribing the form and content of IEPs with the maintenance of a sense of trust in professional autonomy. There are, we suggest, a number of strategies that might be adopted to help them ‘square this particular circle’. These include:

- Ensuring that any guidance that is issued reflects existing ‘best practice’ or has incorporated views of a wide range of practitioners.

- Reviewing the process at regular intervals and being seen to respond efficiently to emerging difficulties.
- Supporting practitioners and schools in the production, storing and monitoring of IEPs through regular dissemination of innovative practice.
- Being sensitive to the prevailing culture(s) (professional and community) by setting realistic expectations but indicating clearly the direction of change that is required
- Recognising the point at which a level of guidance and prescription appropriate for the initial stages of implementation becomes burdensome and can be replaced with 'lighter-touch' policy.

Maximising the potential of IEPs whilst retaining clearly focused objectives

This third issue concerns the potential that IEPs have for impacting on a wide range of policy goals. IEPs, as we have seen, can be used for a number of purposes and to serve a number of interests. They offer a number of opportunities to policy makers, schools, teachers, as well as to parents, pupils and other stakeholders. They can be used as a means of achieving greater accountability and also as vehicles for enhancing parent and pupil participation. Because of this there is a risk for confusion amongst stakeholders over the particular purposes that are intended from the introduction of IEPs. This is a need to see IEPs as part of an overall strategy ensuring that the aims which are set for them are contextualised, philosophically and temporally within the broader policy agenda. This can be helped by:

- Having clear goals – long and short-term for IEPs and making these objectives as clear as possible to all stakeholders from the outset.
- Making sure that the goals intended for IEPs can be mapped realistically onto the overall education strategy (not just in terms of provision for SEN)
- Creating the context for the extension of the use of IEPs by carefully assessing the development needs of stakeholders and planning appropriate training programmes.

Achieving wide ownership whilst creating manageable systems

Despite the ambition of the Scottish Executive that IEPs should be accessible documents with input from a wide range of sources, it is evident that ownership tends to rest with the teachers in the school. In mainstream secondary, this tends to be limited to the learning support teacher. It is important to find ways of involving a wider group of professionals, some of whom have expert knowledge of appropriate teaching methods. It is also important to engage parents and pupils more closely in the process. However, issues of time and efficiency clearly arise here and it is necessary to achieve a balance between ensuring wide involvement and keeping the requirements of IEP production and review within reasonable bounds.

Clarifying the function of IEPs and RoNs

In Scotland at the moment, there are ongoing debates about the future functions of the RoN and the IEP and it has been suggested that IEPs might replace RoNs. In advising on this, it is important to bear in mind the key characteristics of a RoN which are not shared by an IEP. A RoN guarantees multi-disciplinary input, whereas an IEP does not; a RoN requires parental input whereas an IEP does not; a RoN provides grounds for appeal on a number of counts, whereas an IEP does not. It is sometimes suggested that an IEP is a more democratic and inclusive document than a RoN. However, this research demonstrates that IEPs are used in different ways and in relation to different groups of children by different authorities. They differ in format and therefore it is very difficult to make cross-authority comparisons. They are less likely to involve a range of professionals than RoN. They often do not closely involve parents and pupils. Clarity about the respective functions of the two documents is essential and safeguarding the rights of parents and children should be paramount. In the light of the SEN and Disability Act, it will be essential that arrangements in Scotland do not give parents and children fewer rights than are available to parents and children in the rest of the UK.

Clarifying the responsibilities of the Scottish Executive, Education Authorities and Schools for embedding the initiative

A strong message from the research is that many schools felt they needed further support to implement successfully IEPs linked to targets. The greater confidence and competence of the schools involved in the pilot project suggested by the survey data indicates that, for the initiative to achieve its potential, ongoing training, support and guidance is required. Questions arise about where the locus of responsibility for providing this ongoing support rests. The message from schools and EAs, however, is that SEED should continue to play a lead role in supporting the initiative. Some of the problems, particularly in mainstream secondary schools, may be structural and in the light of inclusion policies, they will require further thought and action.

Conclusion

In many ways the IEP initiative for children with special educational needs is popular and is seen by many as offering the opportunity to raise educational standards for this group. However, the initiative is part of the wider raising standards agenda, which is clearly based on the external scrutiny of hard measures of achievement. Further explanation of the raising standards initiative for children with SEN, and discussion of its place within the wider programme, would be helpful.

Mainstream schools, and particularly secondary schools, feel that more time is required to implement the initiative effectively. Consideration needs to be given to cultural and organisational features of secondary schools which pose problems to the smooth implementation of IEPs, particularly in the light of plans to include more children with SEN in mainstream.

A commonly reported fear is that the focus on SMART targets may mean that wider teaching goals are obscured and education may be reduced to a

mechanistic process which is readily captured in simply learning objectives. On-going monitoring will reveal how IEPs affect teacher's classroom practice over time. A further cause for concern is that IEPs appear to involve a rather narrow group of participants and parents and children are often not fully engaged in the process. Clearly a balance needs to be struck between the need to use time efficiently but also to ensure wide involvement in educational planning for individual children. Finally, although the initiative has been broadly welcomed as focusing attention on the educational experiences of children with SEN, all schools feel that they require ongoing support and this may be essential to the effective bedding down of the programme.

The Interchange series

1. *Homework Policy and Practice*
2. *School to Higher Education: Bridging the Gap*
3. *Teaching, Learning and Assessment in the National Certificate*
4. *Developing School Managers*
5. *Transition from School to Adulthood of Young People with Recorded Special Educational Needs*
6. *Discipline in Scottish Schools*
7. *Training the Trainers' Programmes: Effective Management and Monitoring*
8. *Introduction of the New Further Education College Council System*
9. *Young People's Experience of National Certificate Modules*
10. *Costs and Benefits of Adult Basic Education*
11. *Performance Indicators and Examination Results*
12. *An Evaluation of the Advanced Courses Development Programme*
13. *Staying the Course*
14. *A Study of Probationer Teachers*
15. *Making School Boards Work*
16. *Professional Development through Research*
17. *Students' Views on SWAP*
18. *Specific Learning Difficulties: Policy, Practice and Provision*
19. *Foreign Languages in Primary Schools: the National Pilot Projects in Scotland*
20. *Towards More School Based Training?*
21. *Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade Mathematics 3-6*
22. *Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade English 3-6*
23. *Implementing 5-14: a Progress Report*
24. *Education-Business Links: Patterns of Partnership*
25. *Foreign Languages for Vocational Purposes in Further and Higher Education*
26. *School for Skills*
27. *Effective Support for Learning: Themes from the RAISE Project*
28. *Marketing Means Business*
29. *Adult Education: Participation, Guidance and Progression*
30. *Studies of Differentiation Practices in Primary and Secondary Schools*
31. *Health Education: What Do Young People Want to Know?*
32. *Social and Educational Services for Children Under Five*
33. *Issues in Teachers' Continuing Professional Development*
34. *Primary Teachers' Understanding of Concepts in Science and Technology*
35. *Putting 5-14 in Place: An Overview of the Methods and Findings of the Evaluation 1991-95*
36. *Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools*
37. *Implementing 5-14 in Secondary Schools*
38. *Provision for Special Educational Needs*
39. *Methods of Teaching Reading*
40. *Criteria for Opening Records of Needs*
41. *Guidance in Secondary Schools*
42. *Higher Grade Examination Performance (1987-1994)*
43. *Pupils with Special Educational Needs: The Role of Speech & Language Therapists*
44. *Evaluation of the National Record of Achievement in Scotland*
45. *Part-time Higher Education in Scotland*
46. *Educational Provision for Children with Autism in Scotland*
47. *Exclusions and In-school Alternatives*
48. *Devolved School Management*
49. *Implementing 5-14 in Primary and Secondary Schools: Steady Development?*
50. *Early Intervention: Key Issues from Research*
51. *Youth Work with Vulnerable Young People*
52. *Evaluation of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) Extension*
53. *Cost of Pre-School Education Provision*
54. *Managing Change in Small Primary Schools*
55. *Baseline Assessment Literature Review and Pre-School Record Keeping in Scotland*
56. *Schools and Community Education for the Learning Age*
57. *Accelerating Reading Attainment: The Effectiveness of Synthetic Phonics*
58. *Teachers' ICT Skills and Knowledge Needs*
59. *Foreign Languages in the Upper Secondary School: A Study of the Causes of Decline*
60. *Practices and Interactions in the Primary Classroom*
61. *Providing Drug Education to Meet Young People's Needs*
62. *The Attainments of Pupils Receiving Gaelic-medium Primary Education in Scotland*
63. *The Impact of Information and Communications Technology Initiatives*
64. *Parents' Demand for Childcare in Scotland*
65. *Uptake and Perceptions of Early-years' Qualifications*
66. *Developments in Inclusive Schooling*
67. *Raising Attainment of Pupils in Special Schools*
68. *All Day Provision for 3 and 4 Year Olds*
69. *Pre-School Educational Provision in Rural Areas*
70. *Gender and Pupil Performance*

Further information

If you have views on Interchange and/or wish to find out more about SEED's research programme, contact the SEED Research Unit, The Scottish Executive Education Department, Room 1B Docks, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ



ISSN 0969-613X