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Abstract

Background:
The participation of children and young people (CYP) in decisions affecting them is high on the political agenda. CYP with special educational needs (SEN) in the form of social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) continue to be under-represented in the literature with regard to participation and sharing their views. CYP with a statement of SEN must be formally reviewed on an annual basis, which is referred to as the annual statement review (ASR). The current research investigates how CYP with SEBD are presently participating in this formal and regular process that involves reviewing, decision-making and planning around their individual needs.

Methods:
A multiple case study was carried out, which involved two educational provisions, a resource based provision and a special provision, both for CYP with SEBD. Participants included the special educational needs coordinator (SENCo) in each provision, two CYP from the resource based provision, and one CYP from the special provision. Each of the three CYP were the focus of each individual case, with the two CYP from resource based provision being in Key Stage 2 and the individual CYP in special provision in Key Stage 4 of the National Curriculum. Main methods of data collection were semi-structured interview and observation throughout the ASR process. Data was analysed using thematic and content analysis.

Results:
From a critical realist perspective, the investigation revealed that current practice to enable CYP with SEBD to participate in their ASR was found to be good, although it was proposed it could be better. This overall finding is based on the perspective that CYP should have the opportunity to make an impact on the ASR process as well as the outcome through decision-making, no matter how small the decision is that they are involved with. This was not always the case in the current practice examined in the study, more so with the younger CYP attending the resource based provision.

Conclusions:
The findings contribute to developing a good practice model for schools to support CYP with SEBD to effectively participate in review, decision-making and planning around their needs in statutory processes. A further research opportunity would be to investigate such practice in specialist provision for CYP with SEBD on a wider scale by using the survey design, to consider the current findings in a wider context.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

The current research occurred as part of the training requirements for the author to become qualified as an Educational Psychologist (EP). The researcher has a background in working directly with children and young people (CYP), primarily those that have additional needs including learning, language, communication, behavioural, emotional and social needs. In addition, the researcher has worked with a range of adults to support CYP, including those in their family, social care, and school staff. In the current role as a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP), the researcher supports CYP in getting the best out of school by working with them directly, as well as working with key adults, such as their parent(s), class teacher (CT) and school special educational needs coordinator (SENCo).

The researcher brought together her areas of interest: CYP, SEBD and participation, and carried out a literature search to uncover any remaining questions in the literature related to these three individual areas combined. In the Local Authority (LA) where the researcher presently works as a TEP, there are five specialist provisions for CYP with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD), suggesting that school staff would have a level of expertise in supporting CYP with SEBD in these settings. This knowledge contributed to the rationale for carrying out the current research in specialist provision.

With a view to the political context of the research, the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF, 1989) raised the profile of participation and gave CYP all over the world the right to be involved in decisions that affect them (Lansdown, 2011). The participation of CYP is clearly high on the political agenda in the UK and internationally, demonstrated by a breadth of legislation and research recommending the participation of CYP in education, health and social care (DCSF, 2008; DfES, 2003; DfES, 2004a; HM Government, 2005). The participation of CYP with SEN is recommended in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001). However, it has been argued that despite the range of legislation put in place to encourage participation of all CYP, a significant amount of effort is required to translate the relevant policies into practice.

Considering the definition of participation, Lansdown (2011) describes this broadly as “an ongoing process of children’s expression and active involvement in decision-making at different levels in matters that concern them. It requires information-sharing and dialogue
between children and adults based on mutual respect, and requires that full consideration of their views be given, taking into account the child’s age and maturity” (p. 3). There are three influential models of participation identified in the literature, the first suggested by Hart (1992) as the ‘ladder’ of participation, the second by Shier (2001) who developed a model of pathways to participation, and the third by Treseder (1997) who produced a non-hierarchical model of five approaches to participation in decision-making for CYP.

The importance of listening to the views of CYP in practice has been argued in view of Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955), as Roller (1998) suggests that to avoid conflict the unique perspective of individual CYP must be determined by adults for them to act appropriately on their behalf. There is a distinction between gathering the views of CYP and participation that is necessary for the current research. It is argued by the researcher that participation requires the views of CYP, however simply gathering their views should not be mistaken for participation.

The contexts where decisions are made and where CYP are invited to participate have been linked to the potential outcome of decision-making and the impact of participation (Davey, 2010). Research has been carried out to investigate the participation of CYP in the context of health and social care in the areas of planning, decision-making around their needs, and service delivery. Furthermore, decision-making in the context of education has been investigated, and CYP with SEN have been included in this literature (Norwich & Kelly, 2006). In the little research that is available investigating the participation of CYP with SEBD, it is proposed that this group generally do not feel listened to (Davies, 2005).

Effective preparation for participation is highlighted as key, as it is argued to increase the rate of participation and reduce the level of anxiety regarding the participatory event (Ross & Egan, 2004). Davey (2010) suggests that providing CYP with effective mechanisms to engage them in decision-making enables even young children to make responsible decisions. However, young children and those from marginalised groups carry on to be less likely to be involved than others (DCSF, 2008), and pupil participation continues to be difficult for some staff to conceptualise (Kane et al., 2003).

Kane et al. (2003) set out to investigate the feasibility of establishing increased participation of CYP and parents in decisions about educational provision in the Scottish education system, by looking at formal processes. CYP were found to be much more likely to be
involved in the entire process of implementing an individual behaviour plan (IBP), inclusive of review and planning, in comparison to just target setting in the individual education plan (IEP) process. Kane et al. (2003) found that schools reported they had been unsuccessful in enabling CYP to participate in such formal processes.

It is stipulated in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) that when a statement of SEN is reviewed on an annual basis, CYP should be invited to share their views as part of the annual statement review (ASR). DCSF (2008) suggest that to enable CYP to participate in formal meetings, it is important to prepare CYP for their participation in the meeting. Follow-up with the CYP is recommended by DCSF (2008) to take place to create a shared understanding between the CYP and adults. Norwich & Kelly (2006) evaluated how CYP in mainstream settings participated in SEN processes, particularly in decision-making about their additional needs. Norwich & Kelly (2006) found that despite promising practice in schools, there continued to be perceived barriers to obtaining pupils’ views, including tension between enabling and encouraging participation and protecting CYP from any negative impact.

Generally, the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) describes CYP demonstrating features of emotional and behavioural difficulties as those who are “withdrawn or isolated, disruptive and disturbing, hyperactive and lack concentration; those with immature social skills; and those presenting challenging behaviours arising from other complex special needs” (p. 87). It is argued that CYP with SEBD use their behaviour to communicate their needs and to ensure that they are listened to (Faupel & Sharp, 2003). Sellman (2009) proposes that often the opportunities for participation (e.g. councils, forums) are not child-friendly, and the aims of enabling participation of CYP with SEBD should be considered in the planning of such initiatives. The Scottish Executive (2006) argues however, that providing structured support to share views is likely to promote positive behaviour.

In a research project identified to be highly relevant to the current research following the extensive literature review, Hartas (2011) aimed to provide a group of disaffected young people with the opportunity to express their views about the things that affect their life at school in the context of a public forum. Hartas (2011) found that CYP viewed the ways in which they were given the opportunity to participate to be suited only to particular students and to meet the needs of the college, rather than genuinely meet the needs of individual CYP. The CYP who took part in the study valued the opportunity for their voice to be
heard, however it was proposed that the institutional structure of the college resulted in little opportunity for staff and pupils to co-construct their learning.

Following the thorough literature search and taking into account contextual knowledge of the LA, the current research was carried out to investigate how CYP with SEBD attending special and resourced provision are currently enabled to participate in the annual statement review (ASR) process, particularly with aspects of decision-making, planning and review of their needs. The researcher aimed to find out what works best in facilitating participation according to the adults and CYP involved, and how well the processes that are in place to facilitate participation work to include CYP with SEBDs’ views in the ASR process. Overall, the research aimed to produce findings that could contribute to a good practice model for participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process.

For the researcher to achieve the aims of the research and make a contribution to the knowledge base, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?
2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?
3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?

The research was carried out as an embedded explorative multiple case study in two contexts: a resource based provision for CYP with SEBD that was attached to a mainstream primary school, and a special provision for CYP with SEBD catering for CYP of primary and secondary school age. Two CYP from the resource based provision and one CYP from the special provision took part in the research, by allowing their ASR process to be observed by the researcher and then by sharing their views on their experiences of the ASR. Contextual data for the resource based and special provisions was gathered through semi-structured interview carried out with each school SENCo. Hence, the overall findings of the research were informed through triangulation of gathered data.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter presents a detailed review of the literature relevant to an investigation of CYP with SEBD and their participation in the review, decision-making and planning of their needs in statutory processes, specifically the ASR. The aim of the literature review was to identify the research available in this area, to give way to the development of specific and relevant research questions to be answered and therefore contribute unique findings to the already existing knowledge base.

Through carrying out the literature review the researcher aimed to gather information on theory available regarding participation of CYP, including: the political context of CYP and participation; how participation of CYP is defined in practice; the influential models of participation; and literature considering arguments for why CYP should participate processes effecting them. The researcher set out to examine the various contexts in which research had been carried out to investigate the participation of CYP, including health and social care, mental health and education. Following this, the researcher aimed to find out about the development and use of processes to facilitate participation of CYP in the specified contexts. In the context of education, the researcher then aimed to identify research and literature available regarding processes for participation of CYP with SEN in review, planning and decision-making in education.

The researcher carried out a review of the grey literature available regarding SEN and statutory processes currently in place in the UK. The researcher aimed to identify key literature regarding ASR processes, and ways in which CYP were suggested to participate in such processes, which would be highly relevant to set the context for the area of interest in the present research. The final area of the literature review that would provide essential context for the present research was that which focused on CYP with SEBD.

The literature review then aimed to bring the individual parts of the literature search together, identifying any research that had been carried out to investigate the participation of CYP with SEBD in reviewing, planning and decision-making around their needs. The researcher aimed to investigate the differences associated with this group specifically in comparison to the wider and general population of CYP, the challenges of involving CYP
with SEBD, and the benefits of enabling CYP with SEBD to participate. Through carrying out the literature review, the researcher aimed to identify gaps within the existing knowledge base and gather supporting information to contribute to providing a rationale for the present research. The researcher then developed specific research questions aiming to inform the areas identified to be lacking in research and knowledge.

2.2 Literature Search Strategy

The researcher carried out a literature search to identify and locate peer reviewed journal articles to fulfil the aims of the literature search detailed above in section 2.1. The literature search was carried out through the use of the following databases: ERIC, Science Direct, Web of Knowledge and PsychInfo. Further to this, the literature search continued within specific online journals selected on the basis of their relevance to the overall literature search, which were: ‘Educational Psychology in Practice’ and ‘Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties’. Relevant grey literature, specifically Government documentation, was searched for using the ‘Department for Education’ website, and such documentation was also found using search engine ‘Google’.

The literature search strategy was for the following identified key words and phrases related to each of the areas of the literature review to be employed as search terms and used with each database and online journal: ‘annual statement review’, ‘SEN statement’, ‘social, emotional and behavioural difficulties’, ‘SEBD’, ‘decision making’, ‘pupil participation review, plan, decision making’ and ‘SEBD pupil participation review, plan, decision making’. The researcher used a combination of systematic and opportunistic searching throughout the literature review.

2.3 Introduction to Participation and CYP

2.3.1 Political context

The United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF, 1989) raised the profile of participation and gave CYP internationally the right to be involved in decisions that affect them (Lansdown, 2011). The UK Government approved the UN
Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) in 1991, creating a formal agreement to ensure all CYP in the UK have access to their rights (Welsh Assembly Government, 2010). The Children Act 1989 (HM Government, 1989) was published in the UK and made CYPs’ participation in decisions that affect them a requirement by law (Whitty and Wisby, 2007). The Education Act 2002 (HM Government, 2002) specified that CYP must be consulted when decisions are being made that affect their lives.

Later, the Every Child Matters framework (Department for Education and Skills, DfES, 2004a) was supportive of and facilitated the delivery of the Children Act 2004 (HM Government, 2004). Two key strands within the framework, ‘enjoy and achieve’ and ‘make a positive contribution’ played a role in ensuring that CYP had the opportunity to participate in education, support services and out in the community (DCSF, 2008). The Education Act 2005 (HM Government, 2005) stipulated that school inspections carried out by Ofsted must include the views of CYP. The move towards greater participation for CYP is evident in policy documents across health, social care and education (Children’s and Young Peoples’ Unit, CYPU, 2001; DCSF, 2008; DfES, 2003; Department of Health, DoH, 2004a).

CYP with additional needs and SEN have been specifically included in additional legislation and research, therefore their right to participate in decisions affecting them has also been widely advocated (Day, 2008; DfE, 2011a; DfES, 2001; DfES, 2004b). At the time of writing, the UK Coalition Government has and continues to make widespread changes to Children’s Services, with SEN procedures and processes being one of the many areas under review (DfE, 2011b). During this changing time participation appears to have remained high on the political agenda, as can be seen in one of the latest SEN documents in the UK (DfE, 2011b).

Shevlin & Rose (2008) highlight the commitment shown throughout policy, such as the Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of SEN (Department for Education & Employment, DfEE, 1994) in England regarding enabling CYP with SEN to participate in decisions that will affect them. As indicated by Shevlin & Rose (2008), the more recent SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) includes a chapter regarding pupil participation, and references made to pupil participation throughout the document, e.g. ‘student involvement in decision-making during transition’. In summary, DfES (2001) states “Children, who are capable of forming views, have a right to receive and make known information, to express
an opinion, and to have that opinion taken into account in any matters affecting them. The views of the child should be given due weight according to the age, maturity and capability of the child.” (p. 27).

Altogether, it is claimed that these key legislative documents in relation to participation have shown to be beneficial in empowering CYP to participate in making decisions that will affect their lives (Davey, 2010). However, Shevlin & Rose (2008) argue that despite the range of legislation put into place to encourage participation of all CYP, a significant amount of effort is required to translate the relevant policies into practice. Before presenting relevant literature regarding the participation of CYP, the researcher identifies ways in which participation has been defined in the literature.

2.3.2 Defining participation for CYP

Davey (2010) states that there is no definition or meaning of ‘participation’ that is currently universally agreed upon, however the term ‘participation’ most commonly refers to the process of listening to and engaging with CYP. Lansdown (2011) defines participation broadly as “an ongoing process of children’s expression and active involvement in decision-making at different levels in matters that concern them. It requires information-sharing and dialogue between children and adults based on mutual respect, and requires that full consideration of their views be given, taking into account the child’s age and maturity” (p. 3).

Sellman (2009) makes a distinction between two types of participation initiatives for CYP. According to Sellman (2009), one type of pupil empowerment initiative aims to give CYP the opportunity for their voice to be heard. However it is argued that opportunities such as these for CYP to participate are often given to fulfil a particular requirement, for example a learning objective as part of the curriculum (Sellman, 2009). Therefore these opportunities to participate are very much prescribed by adults, and viewed to lead to tokenistic participation (Sellman, 2009). The second type of pupil empowerment initiative occurs in schools described as truly democratic, which have a culture that allows CYP to feel genuinely empowered. Sellman (2009) argues that participation is more often an opportunity for CYP to be heard, rather than to be genuinely empowered. Sellman (2009) states that it is underestimated how much of a cultural transformation is required for CYP
to be genuinely empowered through participation opportunities. Researchers such as Hart (1992), Shier (2001) and Treseder (1997) developed representational models of participation to support participatory practice, which could be viewed as an alternative way to define participation of CYP in practice.

2.3.3 Models of participation

Hart (1992) developed the ‘ladder of participation’ as a model to support participatory work with CYP (for a representation see appendix A). The ladder of participation (Hart, 1992) represents eight degrees of participation, three of which (manipulation, decoration and tokenism) are referred to as non-participation. The remaining five degrees describe increasing levels of participation, ranging from the child being ‘assigned but informed’, right up to ‘child-initiated, shared decisions with adults’ (Hart, 1992). It is argued that a hugely beneficial part of the ladder of participation (Hart, 1992) for practitioners has been the identification of three degrees of non-participation (Shier, 2001). Practitioners have been able to use these descriptions to enable them to eliminate such practice from their work (Shier, 2001).

Shier (2001) acknowledged the considerable influence of the ladder of participation (Hart, 1992) in the research to date, and developed the ‘pathways to participation’ model to serve as an additional tool for practitioners. Shier’s (2001) model has a focus on empowerment and is made up of five levels of participation, with each of these five levels having three stages of commitment to the process of empowerment (for a representation see appendix A). Shier’s (2001) pathways to participation model has been developed with a view to being used as a framework by practitioners to promote participation in their work.

Treseder (1997) developed a model of participation with a non-hierarchical layout to introduce five different approaches to participation of CYP in decision-making (for a representation see appendix A). Treseder’s (1997) use of a non-hierarchical model was based on the acknowledgment that in organisations such as schools, it is not possible to assume that CYP will be able to have full control in decision-making (Shephard & Treseder, 2002). Treseder’s (1997) model of participation in decision-making builds on the five degrees of participation that were identified by Hart (1992). The researcher argues that this adaptation creates a more positive view of each approach to participation, and offers
usability to practitioners being able to employ the framework in organisations such as schools.

For the purpose of the current research, the researcher synthesised the three models of participation described briefly above to produce one model of participation that could be then used to inform data gathering and analysis in the current research (see fig. 2.1).

**Fig. 2.1 Synthesised model of participation, aspects from existing models by Hart (1992), Treseder (1997) and Shier (2001)**

To synthesise the three individual models, the researcher reviewed each of the models looking for similarities and differences between them. Firstly the researcher made a decision to not to include the three levels of ‘non-participation’ found in Hart’s (1992) ladder of participation model. Categorising any of the data as ‘non-participation’ was not viewed to be beneficial to the current research in terms of answering the research questions or fulfilling the overall aims of the research.

The researcher noted that Treseder’s (1997) model included extended descriptions of the five levels of participation that were proposed in the ‘ladder of participation’ (Hart, 1992). Treseder (1997) acknowledged that in certain organisations, such as schools, children would not have the opportunity to take full control in decision-making (Shephard & Treseder, 2002). The researcher would argue that the extended descriptions of Hart’s five degrees of participation used in Treseder’s (1997) model increased the usability of Hart’s framework in research to be carried out in organisations such as schools. The researcher was able to directly combine each of the five levels of participation proposed by Hart (1992) with the extended five non-hierarchical areas of participation in decision-making proposed by Treseder (1997). The researcher identified that each of the five areas of participation described by Treseder (1997) gave reference to CYPs’ participation in the task.
and their contribution to decision-making. Therefore as evident in figure 2.1, the researcher split each of the five descriptions given by Treseder (1997) into these two categories. There were two repetitions within each of these two categories when the five approaches to participation were split in this way, which resulted in there being four parts to each category.

Shier’s (2001) model of pathways to participation was designed in support of Hart’s (1992) model of participation, claiming to be accessible as a tool to be used by practitioners to guide and improve participation processes. Out of the five levels of participation identified by Shier (2001), two referred to decision-making and three referred to the voice of the child. The researcher felt that the levels of participation related to decision-making had already been included in the synthesised model so far, therefore included an additional category labelled the ‘voice of the child’ to include the three levels of participation identified by Shier (2001). Additionally, Shier (2001) included three stages of commitment to empowering CYP through participation: openings, opportunities and obligations. The researcher incorporated a category labelled ‘enabling participation’ in the synthesised model to encompass this aspect of Shier’s (2001) model.

2.3.4 Listening to the views of CYP and participation

In the context of the literature review the researcher considered the question, why should we listen to the views of CYP? Roller (1998) refers to Kelly’s Personal Construct Theory (1955), suggesting that this theory provided a starting point for such an argument. In his theory, Kelly (1955) suggested that the way in which people perceive themselves and view the world is based upon constructs that they develop due to their individual experiences. According to Roller (1998), literature that has given consideration to this theory suggests that when adults act without ascertaining the views and developing an understanding of the constructs of individual CYP, this is likely to create conflict between them. Roller (1998) conveys literature following on from Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955), arguing that each CYP’s perspective is unique and must therefore be obtained by adults for them to act appropriately on their behalf, if conflict is to be avoided.

Roller’s (1998) argument for listening to the views of CYP is relevant in practice when working with and supporting CYP, and debatably links in with CYP having the opportunity
to be involved in decision-making around their needs. On reflection of Roller’s (1998) contribution, in the case of ASRs the researcher suggests that ascertaining the views of individual CYP could contribute to the success of future decisions and plans, as their agreement or sense of being heard and understood may impact on their compliance.

The researcher has given consideration to the psychological rationale behind the importance of listening to the views of CYP, and will now briefly introduce self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 2000) to explain this rationale. SDT ‘emphasises the importance of school-based autonomy and belongingness to academic achievement and psychological adjustment’ (p. 1, Van Ryzin, Gravely & Roseth, 2009). The model provided by SDT suggests that engagement in school acts as a mediator in terms of the influence of autonomy and belongingness on academic achievement and psychological adjustment (Van Ryzin, Gravely & Roseth, 2009). Hence, promoting engagement in school is important to ensure that by providing CYP with autonomy and belongingness in their education will promote positive outcomes.

Van Ryzin, Gravely & Roseth (2009) state that according to the relevant literature, SDT suggests that a highly autonomous learning situation allowing for choice and self-direction will promote pupil motivation, engagement and academic achievement. Belongingness, or relatedness as it is sometimes referred to, is also a key contributor towards these positive outcomes for CYP (Van Ryzin, Gravely & Roseth, 2009). Allowing CYP to have a voice and share their views, and these views being listened to and taken into account, increases the autonomy of the situation and their sense of belongingness. If CYP are asked for their views as part of the ASR process, and they are included in the planning of their participation in terms of opportunities to choose and direct their own involvement, their engagement in the process should then improve. The current research aims to provide a good practice model for promoting the participation of CYP with SEBD in their ASR, which the researcher hopes will contribute to increasing the motivation, engagement and academic achievement of CYP with SEBD.

Ross & Egan (2004) claimed that in the literature in recent years the value placed on gathering the views of CYP regarding the services they use had increased. Aston & Lambert (2010) argued that following a breadth of research carried out to improve knowledge and practice in the area of participation of CYP, there had been very little research so far with a focus to then gather the views of CYP regarding their participation in
decision-making. However, the researcher found that a large-scale research project was carried out by Davey (2010) consisting of five parts, two of which focussed on gathering the views of CYP on their experiences of participation in decision-making.

The large-scale research project summarised by Davey (2010), adapted the definition of participation given by Treseder (1997), which describes participation “as a process where someone influences decisions about their lives and this leads to change” (Davey, 2010, p. 6). Davey (2010) went on to give further insight into the interpretation of this general definition of participation. It was suggested that as researchers they were “interested in not just whether children can freely express themselves, but also if this has influence on a decision and brings about change. The exact change which is brought about will vary on the context but may relate to both process (how children are treated) and outcome (the end result of a decision). It may be a change in law or policy, how a service is delivered or in the values, attitudes and behaviours of adults or children.” (Davey, 2010, p. 6).

The researcher wished to make a distinction between ‘listening to children’ and ‘participation’. The way in which participation could be achieved was missing from the definition and additional interpretation given by Davey (2010). The researcher believes that the method by which participation takes place needs to be specified; therefore they refer back to the definition given by Lansdowne (2011) in section 2.3.2. Lansdowne (2011) refers to the gathering of views of CYP as part of a process of participation that focuses on mutual respect, information sharing and dialogue between CYP and adults. Hence, the gathering of views of CYP is necessary for the process of participation to take place, however gathering views alone does not suggest that participation has taken place.

Despite not being specific about the method by which participation could occur, the researcher is supportive of the definition and its interpretation that is given by Davey (2010). Davey (2010) highlights the importance of considering the context of participation and decision-making when evaluating the impact of participation on change. Davey (2010) emphasises that the treatment of CYP and the final outcome of the decision may be linked to the context, giving further cause to consider the impact of the context on the possibilities of CYP participating in decision-making (Davey, 2010).
2.4 Contexts of participation of CYP

2.4.1 Participation of CYP in contexts of health, social care and mental health services

It is evident that the participation of service users including CYP, in the planning and delivery of health and social care services, has been a primary focus in recent years in the literature (DoH, 2004a; DoH, 2004b; Day, 2008). Day (2008) argues that amongst the literature it is evident that there are various objectives when aiming to involve CYP in decision-making in health care services, including: improving the quality and effectiveness of services; to honour the rights and obligations of CYP; increasing service accountability by enabling CYP to be consumers and stakeholders within services; empowering CYP by improving their knowledge and confidence in the services available to them, resulting in increased control and influence over their experiences in healthcare services; and developing the skills and competencies of CYP. Day (2008) concludes that although the participation of CYP in health services has achieved a high profile in terms of policy, support to work towards achieving the objectives of participation is described is intangible. Day (2008) argues that the optimum ways in which CYP are enabled to participate continue to be in a process of development and further research is needed to identify how different user groups of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) can be supported to participate in decision-making.

Golding, Dent, Nissim, & Stott (2006) reviewed the literature available regarding looked after children (LAC) and participation. They highlighted attention to the complexity of listening to and acting on multiple voices with regards to the care of LAC. According to Golding et al. (2006) it is important “to search for the middle ground between silencing and ignoring those who are receiving services and being overwhelmed by their voices” (p. 28). Golding et al. (2006) felt that working with CYP whose views differed to those of others, would enable CYP to learn how to negotiate and problem-solve with other people, as well as learn how to share their views and listen to the views of others.

Munro (2001) referred to previous literature regarding LAC and how it had frequently been questioned whether they had understood the purpose or content of their LAC review, and whether they had been able to genuinely participate in the process. Munro (2001) conducted a study with LAC to gather their views on the questions stipulated above, but
also on how much power that they felt they had over the decisions that were made about them. Findings suggested that LAC viewed their social worker, the review itself, contact with their birth family, having an advocate, feeling that confidentiality was adhered to and that practice was anti-discriminatory were all important when considering their own impact on decision-making as a LAC (Munro, 2001).

Additionally there has been focus in the literature on participation of CYP in decision-making around their mental health needs (Ben-Arieh, 2005; Paul, 2004). The need for a school-based system of mental health support has been identified within a body of research (Rothi & Leavey, 2006; Ryan, 2007; Weare, 2000; Weare & Markham, 2005). Ross & Egan (2004) suggested that amongst the literature, the focus on gathering the views of CYP about mental health services they used in terms of service evaluation and satisfaction with services was evident. However, ascertaining the views of CYP regarding their satisfaction with services due to the things that were important to them was considerably less evident in the literature.

Ross & Egan (2004) carried out a study to ascertain the views of CYP attending the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) for the first time, using a pictorial critical incident technique to facilitate the process. The authors found that the age of the CYP was key in determining a difference in their level of anxiety about their attendance, as well as how involved they felt in the assessment of their needs. After carrying out their research, Ross & Egan (2004) argued that being provided with preparatory information regarding what to expect during an initial appointment with CAMHS would be beneficial in terms of reducing anxiety, and potentially improved therapeutic effectiveness for CYP. Ross & Egan (2004) note that the literature regarding preparation prior to the event in which a CYP has been asked to attend and take part, suggests that when CYP are effectively prepared then participation is likely to increase and dropout rate is likely to decrease.

Paul (2004) considered the importance of involving CYP in decision-making about their mental health needs in the context of the CAMHS. Paul (2004) highlighted the importance of involving CYP throughout the decision making process including the preparation for making decisions, as he states “If a child does not consider herself to be a partner in the decision-making process she will not actively participate as a decision-maker” (p. 305). Paul (2004) refers to there being two types of decision-maker, which includes a person who are takes part, and a person who has the final say. CYP should be facilitated to engage in
decision-making, by being given time, support and advice from their parents and professionals (Paul, 2004). In the medical context of mental health, Paul (2004) presented the many legal and ethical issues that occur through making decisions about or with CYP. These legal and ethical issues included duty of care, the rights of CYP and parents, capacity and consent, and when there is disagreement between decision-makers.

2.4.2 Participation of CYP in the educational context

Norwich & Kelly (2006) argue that a variety of research has been carried out to investigate CYP and participation in the context of education, incorporating a range of aims and outcomes including school improvement (Ruddock, Chaplain & Wallace, 2005), self-evaluation of schools (MacBeath, 1999), and critique of the lack of participation of CYP (Fielding, 1999). Aston & Lambert (2010) carried out research to find out the views of CYP regarding their participation with decision-making in their education, and investigate how to achieve genuine involvement of CYP in such decision-making. It was found that CYP viewed culture, environment, attitudes and systems to be most important in achieving genuine participation with educational decision-making.

Furthermore, research in education has included exploring the area of CYP with SEN and participation (Jelly, Fuller & Byers, 2000; Norwich & Kelly, 2006; Rose, 1998). Robertson, Emerson, Hatton & Elliott (2005) point out that research investigating the facilitation of participation in school contexts has tended to focus on the participation of CYP with learning and/or communication difficulties. There is little research regarding the participation of CYP with SEBD, however in the research that is available it is proposed that CYP with SEBD often suggest that they generally do not feel listened to (Davies, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999).

2.5 Participation of CYP in Decision-Making Across the UK Today

2.5.1 Large-scale study overview

The National Children’s Bureau (NCB) and the Children’s Rights Alliance for England were commissioned to conduct a large-scale research project that would inform the
National Participation Forum in developing a national participation strategy for England (Davey, 2010). A range of information was gathered regarding how CYP in England were currently participating in decision-making, through use of surveys, focus groups, and review of literature and publications. Davey (2010) made some conclusions following a summary of the five individual studies that were carried out for this project: (1) ‘anyone listening?’ - evidence of CYP's participation in England; (2) participation of CYP in decision-making - survey of organisations; (3) participation of CYP in decision-making - survey of participation workers; (4) participation of CYP in decision-making - a report of CYP's views; and (5) CYP's experience of participation - results from a nationally representative poll. These five individual studies will now be described individually as part of the present literature review.

2.5.2 ‘Anyone listening?’ Evidence of CYP's participation in England

Burke (2010) carried out a review of reports that gave evidence regarding “children and young people being heard and influencing matters affecting them” (p. 8). Reports that were considered to be key to the review were research, policy and grey literature, and they were examined to find information regarding where CYP were claimed to be participating, and the impact of their participation (Burke, 2010). Any significant changes to law and policy related to the participation of CYP since 2004 were also reported in the review (Burke, 2010). Burke (2010) acknowledged that the overall aim was to complement the already existing literature reviews available.

Burke (2010) identified nine key findings following the literature review, which will be included briefly in this section. The changes in legal and policy framework for participation since 2004 that were found were viewed positively and described as improvements by Burke (2010). Evidently there were also new resources and institutions that had been established since 2004 to support the participation of CYP (Burke 2010). Although it was found in the literature that many CYP did not have the opportunity to influence decisions affecting their lives, Burke (2010) found that the number of those reported to be given the opportunity to take part in decision-making had risen since 2004. Burke (2010) reported from the literature review that ‘a significant majority of children’ were found to feel instrumental in ‘day-to-day’ decision-making within their family structure as opposed to anywhere else. Burke (2010) found evidence in the literature to suggest that CYP have a
desire to participate in decision-making in those matters affecting them and they value the opportunity to take part.

Burke (2010) found that there were some decision-making processes that CYP had very little awareness of, including those associated with parental separation or divorce (Burke, 2010). Furthermore, Burke (2010) found that there were some processes within society dominated by ‘adult-centred decision-making processes’, with a marked lack of evidence for any participation of CYP in such areas. These areas of society were identified to include child protection and the juvenile justice system (Burke, 2010), the latter recognised by the researcher as often being linked to CYP with SEBD. Burke (2010) shared that in consideration of personal and significant decisions to be made concerning individual CYP, the evidence in the literature suggested that CYP would be least likely to participate, or if they did participate they would be unlikely to have any significant influence on the outcome. Decisions made in these areas would clearly be potentially life changing for CYP, and it appeared that adults were given sole responsibility for making these decisions without the participation of CYP.

Burke (2010) reported that older and ‘non-disabled’ children were found to be most likely to be involved in decision-making regarding matters affecting them. However, Burke (2010) identified gaps in the literature, including: research investigating the individual differences of CYP and how they might impact on their ability to influence decisions; the participation of CYP in decision-making from ethnic groups; and what was considered to be ‘official’ data collection was reported to have often disregarded the importance of gathering data concerning the experiences of CYP participating in decision-making. Hence, these identified areas would benefit from further research.

2.5.3 Participation of CYP in decision-making: Survey of organisations

Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) carried out an online survey of senior managers with responsibility for participation to examine: the ways in which organisations in England involved children in decision-making at that time; the extent to which they were involved; and the barriers that limited the participation of CYP in decision-making processes as viewed by participants. Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) recruited participants through invitation via directors of Children’s Services, and ‘extensive contacts’ within the voluntary
sector. The majority of participants were from the statutory sector (81%), and there were 229 participants in total. Following a targeted distribution strategy of the questionnaire, Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) managed to successfully recruit participants from each of the nine government regions of England that they had planned to.

Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) stated that the vast majority of organisations reported involvement of CYP in participation work, decision-making, or both, and children’s participation in decision-making appeared to have increased over the last 5 years. The most common methods of participation in practice were reported to be through use of consultation documents, giving CYP the opportunity to be a member of decision-making bodies and committees, and the opportunity to attend service user forums. Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) further found that CYP reportedly became more influential in decision-making since a previous survey carried out in 2004. Despite agreement from respondents that all CYP could be involved in all decisions made about them, it was found by Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a) that CYP aged 14-19 were most likely to be involved in decision-making than any other age group. Respondents were asked to identify from a list of options how participation of CYP could be improved in their organisation, and the most popular options identified were: through increased senior management support with participation, and having specific job roles to support participation of CYP (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010a).

2.5.4 Participation of CYP in decision-making: Survey of participation workers

Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) carried out an online survey to examine the ways in which ‘front-line participation workers’ involved children in the development, delivery and evaluation of policies and services. They also investigated the barriers to participation, and the training and support needs of participation workers. Similar to the study carried out by Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a), a targeted distribution strategy was successfully used to recruit participants from the nine government areas in England (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010b), and data from the sample of 222 participants was gathered and reported.

According to Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b), ‘front line participation workers’ were those who worked “to ensure that children are involved in decision-making processes
through a range of participation strategies that include, but are not limited to, group work, forums, youth councils, consultation groups, committees, advocacy, media and the arts” (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010b, p. 8). The way that these participants were recruited for the survey was through distribution via directors of Children’s Services and through use of ‘extensive contacts’ amongst the voluntary sector. All of those contacted were asked to pass the survey on to relevant colleagues within their own or other organisations (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010b). This method of recruitment resulted in 80% of respondents from the statutory sector and 20% from the voluntary sector, and within this the majority of these respondents were working in the youth and community sector.

Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) reported “a very high level of commitment from frontline participation workers towards involving children in decision-making processes” (p. 35). Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) claimed that this was evident through the majority of respondents having a written policy regarding the participation of CYP in decision-making, and consequently the majority of respondents reported to be involving their CYP in decision-making about policies and services. Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) found that CYP were reported to be involved in a range of decision-making processes, including matters that concerned them as individuals as well as wider organisational policies. A number of methods were commonly used to encourage the participation of CYP, including consultation documentation and public meetings or events. Moreover, the majority of respondents were reported by Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) to hold a positive view about the potential influence of CYP on decision-making processes.

Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010b) concluded that the top two barriers to the inclusion of all CYP in participation were identified as a lack of funding, and a lack of availability of staff to fulfil this specific role. A high demand for training of the participation workers was identified through the research, with specific reference made to the areas of evaluating the participation of CYP, and participation techniques and strategies (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010b).

2.5.5 Participation of CYP in decision-making: A report of CYP’s views

Davey, Burke & Shaw (2010) carried out focus groups with CYP to examine the extent that children felt they had a voice and any influence over matters affecting them. The
researchers examined how this varied by setting and the level of decision-making that was required. Davey, Burke & Shaw (2010) describe a process of recruitment through invitation via participation workers in organisations in England. Twelve focus group interviews were reportedly carried out with groups of 6-8 children (68 CYP altogether). Overall the CYP ranged from age 3 to 20 years, and a fairly equal number of male and female CYP took part. Five groups of CYP were labelled as ‘involved’ as they were already familiar with decision-making processes, and the remaining seven groups were labelled as ‘not involved’. Davey, Burke & Shaw (2010) actively sought CYP from groups that were viewed as less likely to be involved in participation, including very young children, LAC, and disabled CYP. The participant recruitment strategy employed in this study was likely to have been the most efficient way to gather a large and varied sample size such as this one. However, leaving recruitment up to the discretion of the participation worker may have resulted in selection bias. But on balance, the current researcher considers the benefit of gathering a large and varied sample to outweigh the potential cost to the data of selection bias, which could have resulted in CYP being selected based on advantageous individual qualities for such participation.

Davey, Burke & Shaw (2010) concluded, “most children in our sample were generally dissatisfied with their level of input into decision-making processes in school, in the home, and in relation to the area where they lived” (p. 42). Secondly, the researchers concluded that CYP taking part demonstrated an acceptance of the power imbalance in the adult-child relationship. However they did not accept the lack of importance placed on their views by adults and the little, if any, explanation given regarding why their opinions were not taken into account during decision-making (Davey, Burke & Shaw, 2010). Lastly, Davey, Burke & Shaw (2010) found that the young children who took part in the research could approach decision making rationally, supporting the notion that all CYP should be given the opportunity to participate in decisions regarding matters that concern them. The researchers hoped that not only negotiating and thinking skills would develop due to participation, but also CYP would be empowered to have their say, therefore feeling that they are “respected, valued and active citizens in a shared community” (p. 42).
2.5.6 CYPs’ experience of participation: Results from a nationally representative poll

Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lea (2010) recruited 1001 children aged 7–17 years in England to carry out a survey looking at the experiences of CYP participating in decision-making processes in the family, school, and local and national democratic life. The sample for the survey was claimed to be nationally representative as the data gathering was driven by set quotas to recruit specific numbers of participants in the areas of age, gender and region (Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lea, 2010). Although a reasonably sized sample was used for this survey, the current researcher would argue that the sample was not however representative of all CYP in England. There is no detail of other identifying factors for many groups of CYP in our society, including social indicators of need, religion, SEN, language, or ethnicity. The data gathering method of speaking with CYP on the telephone is not inclusive of CYP who do not have access to such methods of communication and those who are unable to communicate verbally. Furthermore, CYP living in families defined as ‘hard to reach’ would have been extremely unlikely to have the opportunity to take part in the research project, due to such limited data gathering methods.

Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lea (2010) stated that 96% of CYP reported that they had been told, usually by their peers, teachers, or parents/carers, about their right to be listened to and have their views taken seriously. When asked how often CYP felt that adults listened to what they had to say, 50% of those who took part reported that this occurred always or most of the time (Davey, 2010). It was found that older CYP were more likely to feel that adults never listened to them and that they had less influence over decisions made in school (Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lea, 2010). This is interesting as older CYP are usually referred to as being more likely to be given the opportunity to participate, as in the study carried out by Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke (2010a). Most of the CYP who took part felt their views were taken seriously either always or most of the time by their family and teachers. However very few felt that their views were taken seriously or had any influence over decisions made by MPs or the government (Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lead, 2010).

The researcher argues that the findings from this survey may have been different if a wider range of minority groups had been deliberately included, for example percentages related to successful participation such as those reported here could have been considerably lower. On face value, the researcher argues that these figures related to the overall complex issue
of participation of CYP in decision-making could be misleading and suggest that more has been achieved in this area for all CYP in England than it actually has.

2.5.7 Summary of progress: Participation of CYP in decision-making

In summary of the five individual research projects, Davey (2010) concludes that financial, cultural and structural improvements have been made in the participation of CYP in decision-making. Davey (2010) claims that the five individual research projects gave a “baseline assessment of the current participation landscape” (p. 14) in England, enabling the strategy for participation to be considered. Davey (2010) refers to the challenges identified through the research collectively, such as the need to involve a wider range of CYP in decisions that affect them. Davey (2010) states the findings have shown that progress needs to be made in the way in which CYP are involved in personal decisions, in addition to decisions that are made in school and in the wider community.

2.6 Processes to Facilitate Participation of CYP

2.6.1 Processes for participation of CYP in health, social care and education

Golding, Dent, Nissim, & Stott (2006) argue that clear processes and procedures must be in place to guide how we listen to and communicate with CYP who are looked after, taking into account their individual abilities, culture and needs. The authors acknowledge that taking the views of CYP into account takes a considerable amount of time, effort and resource. Golding et al. (2006) refer to the process in place for LAC reviews, which includes a ‘review booklet’ that is completed by the CYP prior to the review. If the CYP does not wish to attend the review meeting, their views can still be shared; therefore they can still participate in the form of sharing their views via the review booklet. This process could be viewed as facilitating participation for all CYP taking part in the LAC review process. The argument for the importance of preparation has also been supported in research carried out by Ross & Egan (2004), as CYP are suggested to be more likely to participate following adequate preparation and their level of anxiety regarding the participatory event is likely to decrease.
DCSF (2008) claim that schools have effectively implemented systems to facilitate the sharing of pupil views regarding school development. DCSF (2008) found that CYP tend to be given the opportunity by adults to participate in specific activities and decisions. Rather than being involved in decisions regarding new staff or plans for the school budget, CYP were found by DCSF (2008) to be more likely to be involved in making plans to stop bullying, develop playground equipment and making canteen food availability choices. According to Davey (2010) research findings support this, suggesting that there has been “a steady rise in the number of structural mechanisms to enable children to participate in decision-making through student voice and democracy initiatives in schools and youth forums” (p. 7). Davey (2010) argued that when CYP are provided with effective mechanisms to engage them in decision-making, then even young children are more able to make responsible decisions. However, as discussed earlier, contradicting this Davey (2010) concluded in summary of the five-part large-scale research project that during the previous five years there had been little change reported in the number of children under the age of eight years involved with participation and decision-making. This was despite Davey’s (2010) claim of a steady rise reported through data gathering in supportive mechanisms aiming to enable participation of CYP. These conclusions were made based on data gathered from mainly statutory organisations across the nine government areas in England.

Davey (2010) argues that mechanisms found to be in place to enable CYP to participate in decision-making in schools and other organisations often result in individual or groups of CYP viewed not to be representative of the school population. For example, Davey (2010) describes opportunities in place for CYP to participate in schools, such as to be a member of the school council or youth forum, that are seen by CYP to be limited to those viewed as “‘clever’, ‘popular’ and ‘well behaved’” (p. 8). CYP felt that school councils were not representative of the school community, when considering factors such as age, gender, disability, ethnicity and life experiences (Davey, 2010). According to Davey (2010), data gathered suggested that CYP who were more likely to feel strongly that school councils and forums should be representative of their community were found to be refugee, migrant and disabled CYP. It was suggested by Davey (2010) that making small adaptations to improve the representation of the group would be key in developing an appreciative culture that was respectful of the differences and diversity amongst the school and youth population. However, the current researcher argues that participation requires cooperation; therefore there is an inherent barrier present for many CYP when considering opportunities for all
CYP to participate. It could be argued that specific qualities are needed to successfully cope with and manage opportunities to participate.

DCSF (2008) state that there is not just one way of successfully enabling CYP to participate, and developing successful processes and structures to achieve this can be difficult. A challenge to successfully involving all CYP can be the limited views of those who are in the position to enable participation. Kane et al. (2003) found that primary school staff in particular felt that the ability of CYP to participate in decision-making increased with maturity. The research findings suggested that participation was viewed to be more likely to occur, and occur meaningfully, when CYP were at secondary school age (Kane et al., 2003). DCSF (2008) found that when focusing on decision-making, CYP with a disability as a group were much less likely to be involved in comparison to CYP without a disability. Participation workers involved in the research (DCSF, 2008) reported that they ‘could do better’ at enabling CYP from marginalised groups to participate, hence it could be questioned what has stopped this from happening already.

DCSF (2008) report on a range of benefits due to enabling participation for CYP, fitting into four categories: children’s rights and wellbeing (e.g. enabling CYP to have their say about decisions and services which affect them so that they can be developed sensitively to meet their needs); active citizenship (e.g. giving CYP first-hand experience of how decisions are made and ways to contribute to them); school improvement (e.g. improving behaviour, attendance and engagement in learning); and community enhancement (e.g. providing a way of engaging with socially-excluded groups of CYP).

Despite there being evidence to suggest that some participation processes have become embedded in schools to enable CYP to have a voice, research suggests that processes to enable participation of CYP regarding their own needs in school are less embedded (Kane et al., 2003; Shevlin & Rose, 2008). Furthermore, there is research indicating that pupil participation is something that some school staff can find difficult to conceptualise (Bragg, 2007; Kane et al., 2003). Davey (2010) reports that in the most personal decisions that affect children, such as in their individual healthcare, child protection investigations, and school exclusion, children’s views are commonly not sought or included, or if they are then they usually have very little impact on the outcome. This suggests that the cultural shift described by Davey (2010) in valuing the voice of CYP is not universal across all aspects of participation or groups of CYP.
2.6.2 Processes for participation of CYP with SEN in decision-making in education

Kane et al. (2003) carried out research to investigate the feasibility of establishing increased participation of CYP and parents in decisions about educational provision in the Scottish education system. Kane et al. (2003) used some of the findings from a recent research project investigating the impact of Individual Education Plans (IEPs) on the attainment of CYP with SEN, in order to explicate processes of participation for CYP and parents. Kane et al. (2003) set out to answer the following questions: how will parent and pupil participation be secured as a process within educational provision?; how is the participation of parents and pupils understood by schools?; and finally, how well are schools able to foster the active participation of parents and pupils? Kane et al. (2003) interpreted the findings from a recent research project that had investigated the impact of IEPs on attainment of pupils with SEN with regard to parent and pupil participation to inform the their present research questions, and then made comparisons to findings across Europe and in the United States of America (USA).

The findings suggest that although collaboration with parents and pupils was being recommended in the literature, schools tended to view IEPs as a tool to support planning, and parents and pupils rarely contributed to the process. Pupils were found to be more likely to be involved in setting targets, however school staff tended to take the lead with planning and reviews. Furthermore, Kane et al. (2003) found in the literature as part of their research that when schools were setting Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs) pupils were reported to be much more likely to be actively involved in planning and review processes. The researchers found there to be a wide range of understanding around the term ‘participation’, with reference to involvement being more frequently used for parents and pupils, and collaboration when considering the participation of professionals. Themes of participation and collaboration were evident in the findings in ways that were felt to elucidate existing processes (Kane et al, 2003).

Kane et al. (2003) found that staff from secondary schools reported formal and informal processes that were in place in order to enable participation of CYP. However, those respondents from primary schools reported that children would not be involved with the IEP process due to communication difficulties and a lack of ability to understand the process in order to participate, despite claiming to have a commitment to children’s rights.
in the school ethos. Key to the findings was that Kane et al. (2003) reported that on the whole, schools reported to have been unsuccessful in enabling CYP to effectively participate in formal processes.

2.7 SEN and Statutory Processes in the UK

2.7.1 The ASR

According to the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001), a statement of SEN is required to be reviewed at least annually, as a way of monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the statement for individual CYP. DfES (2001) recommend that CYP, their parents, a representative from the LA, a representative from the school, and all other professionals involved should attend the ASR meeting. The group of people then share information, review progress, discuss any difficulties that have been encountered, and any achievements that the CYP has made (DfES, 2001). As a result of the discussions had, any necessary changes to the description of the CYP’s needs as they are described in their current statement are recommended as part of the ASR process (DfES, 2001). The statement of SEN includes objectives for the CYP identified through statutory assessment of their needs. Any progress made by the CYP towards the recommended objectives is required to be monitored throughout the year, with the ASR providing a platform for different perspectives to come together to share information and review any progress made (DfES, 2001).

2.7.2 CYP participating in SEN and statutory processes

It is clearly stated in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) that where possible CYP should be provided with the opportunity to share their views as part of the ASR. It is suggested in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) that CYP should be given the opportunity to choose the level of support required that will enable them to share their views. DfES (2001) state that having a flexible and coordinated approach when supporting CYP to share their views in the ASR is most effective.
Government guidance given in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) is further evident in local policy, such as in the document detailing ‘Special Educational Needs Arrangements’ in Epton (Borough Council of Epton, BCE, 2010). BCE (2010) highlight the importance of making the views of CYP known, and considering these views throughout statutory processes, including ASRs. BCE (2010) declare that all procedures in Epton related to statutory processes have been updated to include gathering the views of CYP. BCE (2010) state that wherever appropriate all CYP should be given the opportunity to participate in decisions about their education when discussed in their ASR. BCE (2010) make reference to the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) when rationalising the importance of including the views of CYP in statutory processes, demonstrating that the council arrangements for supporting SEN are reflective of Government policy and legislation.

DCSF (2008) provides guidance for professionals to enable participation of CYP in formal meetings, such as ASRs. To facilitate participation for CYP, LAs and schools can structure formal meetings and provide accessible information to CYP so that they can be fully informed about what to expect prior to the meeting (DCSF, 2008). Schools should attempt to involve CYP in planning the format of any formal meetings, including who will attend the meeting and when and where it will take place, the purpose of the meeting and the desirable outcomes (DCSF, 2008). DCSF (2008) refer specifically to measures that should be taken to prepare CYP for their participation in formal meetings, and consider this to be a part of the overall process for the meeting. To attend and participate in a formal meeting, DCSF (2008) suggest that CYP may need to be supported using practical preparation as well as emotional support. DCSF (2008) encourages professionals to support CYP to plan ahead for their participation in a formal meeting. CYP should be encouraged to consider any potential challenges they might experience during the process, and the ways in which they plan to communicate their views to the group attending the meeting (DCSF, 2008). It is finally recommended by DCSF (2008) that CYP who have participated in a formal meeting should be given follow-up support from an adult, with an aim of promoting a shared understanding between the CYP and adults, and reassuring the CYP that they will continue to receive the support that they need in the future.

Aston & Lambert (2010) make reference to CYP being invited to attend their ASR and participate in such a process in a tokenistic manner. Aston & Lambert (2010) suggest that in these circumstances involving traditional meetings, CYP are simply invited to listen to
and perhaps agree with the decisions that have been made for them regarding their individual needs and future. Aston & Lambert (2010) suggest that LAs who have implemented the use of Child Centred Planning and other less traditional methods of reviewing progress and making decisions, help CYP to feel that they have more control over their education and plans for the future.

2.7.3 Policies and procedures for participation of CYP in SEN processes

Norwich & Kelly (2006) evaluated how CYP in mainstream settings participated in SEN processes, particularly in decision-making about their additional needs. The research aimed to report on how and when CYP were consulted in schools according to the SEN Code of Practice and the principles and procedures that they include. Furthermore, the research aimed to demonstrate how EPs might evaluate and support the development of policies and procedures for participation in SEN procedures.

Norwich & Kelly (2006) described the research project that used a number of data collection methods in order to produce a comprehensive data source, which included: a postal survey questionnaire of 10 Local Education Authorities (LEAs); LEA officer interviews; a postal survey questionnaire of SENCos in all mainstream primary and secondary schools in 7 of the previously surveyed LEAs; semi-structured interviews with 12 SENCos, 10 head teachers (HTs), 5 teachers, 20 teaching assistants (TAs) and 91 children (across 18 schools – primary and secondary). Within the group of children, 11% had ‘sensory’ SEN, 14% had ‘communication and interaction’ SEN, 19% had ‘cognition and learning’ SEN, and 56% had ‘behavioural, social and emotional’ SEN. The majority of pupil participants were at the level of School Action (SA) SEN (42%), followed by those pupil participants with a statement of SEN (30%), then pupil participants at the level of School Action Plus (SA+) SEN (28%).

Norwich & Kelly (2006) found that despite a range of practice in schools that suggested great potential for successful participation in SEN procedures, there continued to be a wide range of perceived barriers to obtaining pupils’ views, so that negotiations around decisions that affect them could be carried out. The researchers were able to propose a model in order to bring to light the key themes that were identified in their study. The model highlights three aspects of participation: distinguishing between ‘eliciting pupils’ views and
preferences’ and ‘shared negotiations and decision-making’; the role of formal and informal participation processes; and limitations of participation practices, including child and adult skills and competencies, lack of opportunities and resources, and inappropriate methods of eliciting views. A key finding in terms of limitations of participation practices was surrounding child protective values. Adults who were interviewed felt genuinely concerned regarding participation leading to threats to pupils’ self esteem and asking too much of them in terms of their capacity to manage the task of decision-making. Norwich & Kelly (2006) suggested that their findings raised a tension between participation and this protectiveness that was discussed.

In terms of the significance of this study for further research, Norwich & Kelly (2006) suggest that it would be helpful to continue research investigating participatory practice within schools and services, to further the understanding of the issues and challenges that occur. Norwich & Kelly (2006) highlight the question that has come about throughout the research, regarding whether there are limits to seeking and gathering CYPs’ views. The researchers also identified a need for further research to enable future practical developments. Their model has been incorporated into a self-review instrument for schools and other organisations that support CYP with SEN.

2.8 Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties and Participation

2.8.1 Defining SEBD

SEBD is described as an ‘imprecise umbrella term’ (Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties Association, SEBDA, 2006), and developing a definition that is agreed upon has proven to be problematic throughout the literature (Fovet, 2011; Visser & Cole, 2003). The definition of SEBD in the literature has varied over time and across countries (Visser & Cole, 2003). In acknowledgement of the difficulty in developing a definition that could be agreed upon, Maras (1996) attempted a brief description of CYP with SEBD as “suffering disruption of a number of emotional and social functions” (p. 34). Fovet (2011) on the other hand defines CYP with SEBD as having a specific difficulty with making the “socially acceptable distinction between ‘private’ world and ‘social’ context… to achieve ‘functional’ status” (p. 249). A primary focus in much of the literature has placed high emphasis on the ‘social’ aspect of the term SEBD in terms of the cause of difficulties
As SEBD has been found to be present across the human population regardless of socioeconomic status, Fovet (2011) refers to the need to locate a ‘common denominator’ amongst CYP to properly assess and understand SEBD rather than focusing on a ‘social’ cause. Moreover, Fovet (2011) argues against use of the medical model to explain SEBD, which suggests biological imbalance to be the cause of behavioural difficulties.

Visser & Cole (2003) argue that many of the definitions of SEBD that have been put forward within the literature describe the nature of difficulties as challenging to the formal educational functions of schools and educational settings. Visser & Cole (2003) report ongoing discussion regarding the accurate identification of CYP with SEBD and identifying the most suitable educational provision to meet their needs, as well as appropriate and successful interventions, as other areas of difficulty for those supporting CYP whose needs are associated with the umbrella term of SEBD. Visser & Cole (2003) argue that due to the wide and varying definitions offered to categorise those presenting with SEBD, it is extremely difficult to determine the numbers of those CYP who are affected.

### 2.8.2 A graduated definition of SEBD for a graduated response

By exploring the definition given by the UK Government in reference to CYP with SEBD, the researcher aimed to create an understanding of the types of difficulties that CYP in this group may be experiencing in order to have been given a statement of SEN in the UK to meet their needs in education, in respect of the focus of the present research. Most recently in SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001), a graduated definition of SEBD has been described inline with the graduated response that is to be in place for CYP with SEN.

When supporting CYP at the SA level, SEBD are defined as “persistent emotional and/or behavioural difficulties, which are not ameliorated by the management techniques usually employed in the school, prompting additional intervention” (DfES, 2001, p. 69). Moving on to the SA+ level, SEBD are defined as “emotional or behavioural difficulties which substantially and regularly interfere with their own learning or that of the class group, despite having an individual management programme” (DfES, 2001, p. 71). When an educational provision is at the stage of considering whether a statement of SEN for SEBD
is needed, they are advised in the SEN Code of Practice to look for “Evidence of significant emotional or behavioural difficulties, as indicated by clear recorded examples of withdrawn or disruptive behaviour; a marked and persistent inability to concentrate; signs that the child experiences considerable frustration or distress in relation to their learning difficulties; difficulties in establishing and maintaining balanced relationships with their fellow pupils or with adults; and any other evidence of a significant delay in the development of life and social skills” (DfES, 2001, p. 83). In the present research, it is assumed that CYP in England who are in receipt of a statement of SEN for SEBD can be described as they are in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001).

The SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) describes CYP demonstrating features of emotional and behavioural difficulties as those who are “withdrawn or isolated, disruptive and disturbing, hyperactive and lack concentration; those with immature social skills; and those presenting challenging behaviours arising from other complex special needs” (p. 87). It is also recognised in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) that medical conditions can also have a significant impact on a child’s behaviour or emotional state, resulting in a significant impact on the child’s experience of school and their ability to function in the school environment. Examples of such medical conditions could include Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), and Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD). LAAs are advised to consider whether the needs of these children can be met either through SA, SA+ or if a statutory assessment is required to meet the needs (DfES, 2001).

2.8.3 Pupil empowerment and participation of CYP with SEBD in specialist provision

Sellman (2009) set out to investigate pupil participation in a special school for CYP with SEBD, with a particular focus on the implementation of student voice and pupil empowerment projects in this type of setting and the processes involved. Sellman (2009) claimed that although student voice and pupil empowerment projects were considered to be common in many mainstream schools, it was seen to be more challenging to successfully implement such projects and strategies in SEBD special schools.

The research project was carried out in a special school for CYP with SEBD, which accommodated approximately 50 boys and offered non-residential education. All pupils
were invited to volunteer to take part in the research project, which resulted in 6 participants. The HT of the school was interviewed to gain information about the school ethos and setup, obtain consent for taking part in the research. A focus for the student research group was negotiated with the HT, which was to review the behaviour policy for its first brief. It was planned that school staff would concurrently review this same policy.

Seven meetings with the CYP took place in all, each lasting approximately 45 minutes and taking place on a weekly basis. The initial session was carried out using an agenda that was set by the researcher, which included a group contract that was drawn up with the CYP and a discussion around confidentiality. In sessions thereafter the agenda was co-planned with the participants. Sessions were run similarly to the way focus groups and forums tend to be run, and the research group had two aims that were explained to the group by the researcher: to uncover their own perspectives on the behaviour management policy, and to develop their own questions and themes to inform an investigation to establish the perspectives on this policy of other pupils.

Sellman (2009) acknowledged various limitations of the study, such as that the research included a single case study with mixed success, making it difficult to generalise from the findings. The selection process required pupils to volunteer, which may have resulted in a skewed dataset consisting of participants in the more literate, mature and pro-democratic group within the student body (Sellman, 2009). Furthermore, Sellman (2009) acknowledged the impact of investigating a phenomenon such as participation of CYP with SEBD as part of a group when group dynamics can have a significant impact and possibly result in inhibited individual responses. However, advantages of group research such as participants being able to share their views and respond to others were also acknowledged. Sellman (2009) reported that group dynamics were reflected on throughout the process of data gathering and overall the project was relatively successful.

On reporting the findings, Sellman (2009) commended the SEBD special school that took part in the research for “both its initial willingness to listen and furthermore its commitment to act upon the findings of the students’ report” (p. 45). Findings from the student research group were reported to be far more “illuminating” than when the school staff engaged in a comparable review process of the policy (Sellman, 2009). Sellman (2009) stated that the key point to be taken from this research project, is that CYP with SEBD have demonstrated through participating in the research that they are capable of engaging in processes of pupil empowerment and student voice projects. CYP with SEBD are less
likely to be given the opportunity to engage and participate in such projects, therefore essentially the findings challenge common practice in this area, and reveal that when asked these pupils can convey extremely important messages that school staff feel the need to listen and respond to (Sellman, 2009).

2.8.4 Specific consideration for participation of CYP with SEBD

The nature of SEBD are known to cause disruption in school environments and challenges to school staff (Sellman, 2009). Faupel & Sharp (2003) conducted a functional analysis of behaviour of children with SEBD and found that those behaviours that were externalised served a function of communicating their goals and needs to teachers. An argument regarding CYP with SEBD and their participation put forward by Sellman (2009) is that these CYP are and have been ensuring that they have made themselves heard through ways such as these. Perhaps this is due to CYP with SEBD often not being given the opportunity to be heard in other more socially acceptable ways. Alternatively, perhaps this is due to this being their most preferred or only way that they feel they can express themselves successfully.

It is evident in the research that specifically CYP with SEBD may benefit from having their voice heard regarding their individual needs, so that adults can support them in the best way possible. Sellman (2009) argues that CYP with SEBD have shown in research that they have accepted and absorbed the ‘dominant cultural voice’ regarding their difficulties. For example, Cooper & Shea (1998) reported a view held my CYP with SEBD that the difficulties they experience are innate biological conditions out of their control. Sellman (2009) highlights the importance of gaining the views of CYP with SEBD in order to provide them with a safe and positive platform where this possibly unhelpful viewpoint can be challenged and reconceptualised.

Sellman (2009) makes the point that according to the literature, often when CYP are given the opportunity to have their voice heard, it is within a structure not dissimilar to those used in adult outlets such as councils, focus groups and forums, including the use of an agenda, minutes, and actions. Sellman (2009) proposes that such structures are not child-friendly and in terms of CYP with SEBD the values and preferred means of communication found in theses structures often are difficult for them to engage with.
Sellman (2009) argues that consideration must be given to how realistic aims of CYP with SEBDs’ participation are when planning such initiatives. On the other hand, it has also been argued that giving pupils structured support to enable them to contribute their views to decisions affecting their lives is important when promoting positive behaviour (Scottish Executive, 2006). Therefore both of these points may be useful to consider when planning the processes for participation initiatives involving CYP with SEBD.

### 2.8.5 Disaffected CYP want to have a say in how they share their views

Hartas (2011) reports on a study carried out with 18 ‘disaffected’ pupils aged between 13 and 15 years who were attending a college in the UK. Pupils described by college staff to be disaffected were recruited using purposive sampling techniques by three staff members and the researcher. Hartas (2011) reports that pupils were described as disaffected if they chose to engage in learning and other aspects of school only in a limited capacity. At the time of carrying out the research the college was involved in developing an informal public forum to unify the views of 13–15 year-old pupils about participation in learning and training. Pupils that had been identified as disaffected were not being represented in the forum at that time. Hartas (2011) reports that staff wished to facilitate participation of the disaffected students in the forum, as they believed that as a result their academic progress would be likely to improve. Staff also believed there would be wider positive personal and organisational outcomes following effective participation of the disaffected CYP in the forum. Hartas (2011) included this implicit belief in his research due to acknowledging that this may well have had an impact on the findings due to college staff having involvement throughout the study.

The aim of the research was to provide the disaffected young people with the opportunity to express their views about the things that affect their life at school in the context of a public forum (Hartas, 2011). A case study was carried out using small focus groups (made up of approximately six pupils) and interviews with individual young people to gather the required information (Hartas, 2011). The young people took part in the public forum in this way for three days, and were excused of all lessons. The participants agreed the issues that were going to be discussed during their participation in the forum on the first day, and they included teaching and learning, participation and access to services, employment and training opportunities (Hartas, 2011).
When investigating participation with the disaffected CYP, Hartas (2011) found that CYP viewed the ways in which they were given the opportunity to participate to be suited only to particular students. For example, those who “value formal education, are responsive to the institutional requirements of the schools and believe in the award-led training and future job opportunities the school has to offer” (p. 112, Hartas, 2011). It was felt by CYP taking part in this study that participation processes were developed to meet the needs of the college that they attended, rather than to meet the needs of the individual CYP (Hartas, 2011). CYP who were deemed as disaffected expressed that they valued the opportunity to participate and have a voice. However, Hartas (2011) reports the nature and usefulness of the existing modes of participation were questioned by the CYP who took part. Hartas (2011) proposed that the institutional structure of the college resulted in little opportunity to co-construct their learning and their social experiences being constrained.

Critically, although referring to CYP as ‘disaffected’ and giving a description of what this would look like in real terms in the college might be helpful to readers, the selection process of using purposive sampling to identify CYP matching this description is perhaps subjective. It could be argued that children may be displaying these characteristics in college for a range of reasons; therefore it may not necessarily be appropriate to group these children together in this category and then explore their views in the light of them being ‘disaffected’. Hartas (2011) carried out the research project using a limited age range of pupils; therefore it may be helpful to gather information from a wider age range of CYP in future research.

### 2.8.6 Challenges to participation of CYP with SEBD

Limitations and challenges of CYP and participation often become more pronounced when attempting to facilitate participation in provision for CYP with SEBD (Davies, 2005). Respondents taking part in research conducted by Kane et al. (2003) reported on the nature of the child’s difficulties to present challenges to enable participation, making specific reference to CYP with SEBD. Kane et al. (2003) reported that respondents felt that CYP with SEBD were likely to experience difficulties with self-esteem, which impacted on their view of how able they would be to participate. They felt that setting targets with CYP and having the possibility of these targets not being met would be too much for CYP with SEBD, in consideration of their low self-esteem. This feeling of ‘protectiveness’ of CYP
with SEBD was supported by research carried out by Norwich & Kelly (2006). It is proposed that there are times when adults can be overprotective of CYP in this way, which can result in them underestimating their ability to participate successfully (Norwich & Kelly, 2006).

The researcher suggests that in terms of the ASR process feeling protective of CYP with SEBD could be advantageous, for example it might encourage practitioners to spend additional time and effort planning the process or participation to ensure a positive and meaningful experience is had by CYP. This might then empower CYP to “access their rights to participation and to have their say” (Davey, Burke & Shaw, 2010, p.42) and therefore consider sharing their views to be important and beneficial to themselves and others. However, it would be important to avoid this sense of protectiveness becoming over protectiveness, which could be disadvantageous to CYP. For example by limiting their opportunities to participate meaningfully or have their voices heard, therefore leaving them “feeling belittled, powerless and undervalued” (Davey, Burke & Shaw, 2010, p. 42).

In terms of the ASR process, the researcher suggests that all people invited to be part of the decision-making process, including CYP, parents, teachers and professionals, need to have their views heard and listened to, and all views should be considered important.

Laenen (2009) reports that CYP with SEBD are generally viewed as being ‘difficult to reach’ and to study. Children who are in trouble with the law are one of the groups to be identified as being under-represented in the literature (DCSF, 2008). One may consider such children who are in trouble with the law to be those experiencing SEBD to some degree. Davies (2005) highlights that CYP with SEBD have often experienced education concurrently to individual and family stress, and can be typically resentful, alienated and defensive. Even though CYP with SEBD are often in great need of the services they receive, they are least likely to be asked for their “opinions as consumers” (p. 324, Laenen, 2009). These factors may contribute to the explanation for why CYP with SEBD are under-represented in the participation literature. However, in the limited research that is available investigating CYP with SEBD and participation, it is argued that findings suggest that they are capable of taking part and have important things to say (Hartas, 2011; Norwich & Kelly, 2006; Sellman, 2009). As Davies (2005) argues, continued failure to ascertain the views CYP with SEBD is likely to further maintain their negative experiences of school.
An alternative argument to explain the gap in the literature of participation and CYP with SEBD is that there appears to be conflict between views of common practice in SEBD provision and expectations of what participation entails (Sellman, 2009). Cole, Visser & Upton (1998) suggest that provision is often based upon well-organised structures and routines that are under the control of adults, as well as firm boundaries. Sellman (2009) presents research suggesting that many teachers feel concerned about giving mainstream pupils power and control in decision-making in schools, which can result in staff resisting the implementation of pupil empowerment initiatives (Lewis & Burman, 2008; MacBeath, 2006). Sellman (2009) argues that teachers in special provision for SEBD are likely to feel increasingly concerned about this issue in comparison to those teaching in mainstream provision.

2.9 Summary of the Literature Review and Rationale

2.9.1 Literature review summary

The United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF, 1989) raised the profile of participation and gave CYP all over the world the right to be involved in decisions that affect them (Lansdown, 2011). The participation of CYP is clearly high on the political agenda in the UK and internationally, demonstrated by a breadth of legislation and research recommending the participation of CYP in education, health and social care (DCSF, 2008; DfES, 2003; DfES, 2004a; HM Government, 2005). The participation of CYP with SEN is recommended in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001). However, it has been argued that despite the range of legislation put in place to encourage participation of all CYP, a significant amount of effort is required to translate the relevant policies into practice.

Lansdown (2011) defines participation broadly as “an ongoing process of children’s expression and active involvement in decision-making at different levels in matters that concern them. It requires information-sharing and dialogue between children and adults based on mutual respect, and requires that full consideration of their views be given, taking into account the child’s age and maturity” (p. 3). Hart (1992) developed the ladder of participation model, Shier (2001) has developed a model of pathways to participation, and Treseder (1997) produced a non-hierarchical model of five approaches to participation in
decision-making for CYP. The researcher developed a synthesised model incorporating the key aspects from each of these models to support data collection and analysis (see fig. 2.1).

The importance of listening to the views of CYP in practice has been argued in view of Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955), as Roller (1998) suggests that to avoid conflict the unique perspective of individual CYP must be determined by adults for them to act appropriately on their behalf. There is a distinction between gathering the views of CYP and participation that is necessary for the current research. It is argued by the researcher that participation requires the views CYP, however simply gathering the views of CYP should not be mistaken for participation.

The contexts where decisions are made and where CYP are invited to participate have been linked to the potential outcome of decision-making and the impact of participation (Davey, 2010). Research has been carried out to investigate the participation of CYP in the context of health and social care in the areas of planning, decision-making around their needs, and service delivery. Furthermore, decision-making in the context of education has been investigated, and CYP with SEN have been included in this literature (Norwich & Kelly, 2006). In the little research that is available investigating the participation of CYP with SEBD, it is proposed that this group generally do not feel listened to (Davies, 2005).

In summary of a large-scale research project investigating the progress made in participation of CYP in decision-making in England, Davey (2010) concluded that financial, cultural and structural improvements have been made. However, Davey (2010) found challenges continuing to threaten the participation of all CYP in processes for decision-making around their needs, therefore urging specific improvements to include CYP in personal decisions and those made in school and the community.

Preparation for participation is highlighted as key in participation processes in terms of giving CYP an alternative context and additional methods to share their views, which is argued to increase the rate of participation and reduce the level of anxiety regarding the participatory event (Ross & Egan, 2004). Davey (2010) suggests that providing CYP with effective mechanisms to engage them in decision-making enables even young children to make responsible decisions. However, young children and those from marginalised
groups carry on to be less likely to be involved than others (DCSF, 2008), and pupil participation continues to be difficult for some staff to conceptualise (Kane et al., 2003).

Kane et al. (2003) set out to investigate the feasibility of establishing increased participation of CYP and parents in decisions about educational provision in the Scottish education system, by looking at formal processes. CYP were found to be much more likely to be involved in the entire process of an IBP, inclusive of review and planning, in comparison to just target setting in the IEP process. Kane et al. (2003) found that schools reported they had been unsuccessful in enabling CYP to participate in such formal processes.

It is stipulated in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) that when a statement of SEN is reviewed on an annual basis, CYP should be invited to share their views as part of the ASR. DCSF (2008) suggest that to enable CYP to participate in formal meetings, it is important to prepare CYP for their participation in the meeting. Follow-up with the CYP is recommended by DCSF (2008) to take place to create a shared understanding between the CYP and adults. Norwich & Kelly (2006) evaluated how CYP in mainstream settings participated in SEN processes, particularly in decision-making about their additional needs. Norwich & Kelly (2006) found that despite promising practice in schools, there continued to be perceived barriers to obtaining pupils’ views, including tension between enabling and encouraging participation and protecting CYP from any negative impact.

Generally, the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) describes CYP demonstrating features of emotional and behavioural difficulties as those who are “withdrawn or isolated, disruptive and disturbing, hyperactive and lack concentration; those with immature social skills; and those presenting challenging behaviours arising from other complex special needs” (p. 87). It is suggested in the research that CYP with SEBD use their behaviour to communicate their needs and to ensure that they are listened to (Faupel & Sharp, 2003). Sellman (2009) proposes that often the opportunities for participation (e.g. councils, forums) are not child-friendly, and the aims of enabling participation of CYP with SEBD should be considered in the planning of such initiatives. The Scottish Executive (2006) argues however, that providing structured support to share views is likely to promote positive behaviour.

Hartas (2011) aimed to provide a group of disaffected young people with the opportunity to express their views about the things that affect their life at school in the context of a
public forum. Hartas (2011) found that CYP viewed the ways in which they were given the opportunity to participate to be suited only to particular students and to meet the needs of the college, rather than genuinely meet the needs of individual CYP. The CYP who took part in the study valued the opportunity for their voice to be heard, however Hartas (2011) proposed that the institutional structure of the college resulted in little opportunity for staff and pupils to co-construct their learning.

2.9.2 Rationale for the present research

CYP with SEBD have been found to be capable of taking part in research and contributing valuable information (Hartas, 2011; Norwich & Kelly, 2006; Sellman, 2009), nevertheless they often feel that they are not listened to (Davies, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999). Despite these findings, CYP with SEBD continue to be under represented in the literature in terms of participation in decision-making, planning and review of their needs, particularly in formal and statutory processes such as the ASR. Laenen (2009) claims that CYP with SEBD are often difficult to reach and to study, and even though they are in great need of the services that they receive, their views about the services are less likely to be sought. As Davies (2005) argued, continued failure to ascertain CYP with SEBDs’ views in practice is likely to further maintain their negative experiences of school.

An argument to explain the gap in the area of CYP with SEBD and participation is that the challenges to achieving participation with all CYP tend to increase when working with CYP with SEBD (Davies, 2005). Those working with CYP with SEBD often have a sense of protectiveness over them in terms of the negative impact their participation might have on their already poor self-esteem (Kane et al., 2003; Norwich & Kelly, 2006). Alternatively, it is argued in the research that there is conflict between what is expected in terms of participation and common everyday practice with CYP with SEBD (Sellman, 2009). Sellman (2009) suggests that considering the concerns of mainstream staff about giving their pupils a level of power in decision-making, these concerns are likely to increase in provision for CYP with SEBD. Hence, participation in practice with CYP with SEBD is thought to be more challenging to develop and establish in educational provision. Due to the lack of literature in this area, the views of CYP with SEBD about their own participation in planning, review and decision-making remains unclear. Additionally information regarding the extent to which decisions around CYP with SEBD include their
views, the processes that are in place in order to achieve this and the ways in which the participation of CYP with SEBD is facilitated are also areas of the knowledge gap that have been identified.

Research suggests that CYP with SEBD may struggle to participate and engage in formal opportunities (Sellman, 2009). The ASR process is likely to be formal and therefore more socially demanding for CYP with SEBD than day-to-day situations where participation in decision-making, planning and review could also take place. However, the researcher has chosen to focus on the ASR process rather than day to day participation, as this is a crucial forum in which CYP have the opportunity to have their say about their own needs and contribute to decision making, which is a key focus in the ASR. The ASR process should provide the researcher with a platform to contribute to the area of research that has been identified for study through the detailed literature review. The ASR process is an important process for CYP with SEN, including SEBD; therefore information gathered investigating participation in this process should be influential in future practice.

Considering the research plans to investigate CYP with SEBDs’ participation within ASR processes, and on reflection of the summarised literature available, the current researcher set out to make the views of CYP themselves key to the findings. The views of a key adult in school, who was identified as the SENCo in each educational provision, were sought and included in the research to contribute to establishing a rich and detailed picture of the context as well as current practice in special and resource based provision for CYP with SEBD. The research was carried out in special, and resource based provision for CYP with SEBD because staff were viewed to be experts in supporting CYP with such difficulties. It was felt that research findings would be most beneficial to those with a high number of CYP with a statement of SEBD, as they would be carrying out a high number of ASRs year upon year. The researcher felt that it was essential that the research findings were relevant and fitting to such specialist settings specifically for CYP with SEBD.

2.10 Expected Contribution to Knowledge and Research Aims

The research aims to investigate how CYP with SEBD attending special and resource based provision are enabled to participate in decision-making, planning and review of their needs as part of the ASR process. Further to this, the research aims to find out what CYP
and adults view to work best in facilitating participation, and how well the processes that are in place to facilitate participation work to include the views of CYP with SEBD throughout the ASR process.

Overall, the researcher aims to provide findings of a practical nature that will contribute to a good practice model for participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process. Hence the researcher plans to make recommendations that could contribute to a strategy to develop practice within education systems to enable successful participation of CYP with SEBD in decision-making, planning and review cycles as part of formal processes such as the ASR process. This research therefore is anticipated to be beneficial to practitioners supporting CYP with SEBD in the range of educational provision available in the LA where the research has been carried out, in addition to those similar that are further afield.

The researcher will offer to provide feedback on the findings to the school staff that took part in the research in the form of a meeting where discussion and questions could take place. For the CYP who took part in the research feedback on the findings would be given on an individual basis in a child friendly written format. The researcher would disseminate the research findings to Epton Educational Psychology Service (EPS) in the form of a presentation to the team with time for discussion, questions and information sharing.

It was suggested by the researcher that through taking part in the research the individual provisions would benefit from gaining feedback from the researcher as an outsider to their organisation on the ASR process and how it was experienced by the CYP who took part. The researcher hoped that this knowledge and feedback would be influential in how staff in the special and resource based provision would view the process and their future practice in this area particularly, contributing to development of processes.

This contribution to the knowledge base is proposed to benefit the EPS where the researcher is employed by providing the team with detailed findings from the multiple embedded case studies, to equip them in their work in the borough. EPs in Epton EPS could share the knowledge from the current research with educational providers and school staff in their practical work, giving advice and recommendations with a view to carrying out the ASR process to encourage participation of CYP with SEBD.
2.11 Research Questions

For the researcher to achieve the aims of the research and make a contribution to the knowledge base, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?

2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?

3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?
3.1 Chapter overview

The story of how the researcher went from reviewing the literature to being in the position to report findings from the data that was collected can be found in this chapter. This chapter gives a detailed description about the way in which the current study was carried out, including the rationale and research questions that were developed following an extensive literature review. The multiple case study design is introduced, and the processes that the researcher followed to recruit participants, gather and analyse data, and ethical guidelines and protocols that were followed are included in this chapter.

3.2 Rationale

Following a detailed literature review, the researcher identified a need for further research regarding how CYP with SEBD participate in planning, review and decision-making around their needs. A need for further research within this area was found with specific regard to the ASR process and how CYP participate in the planning, review and decision-making aspects of these statutory processes. Hence, the researcher set out to investigate: how CYP with SEBD attending special and resource based provision were participating in the ASR process; what worked best in facilitating this type of participation; and to what level the CYP with SEBDs’ participation was influential in any plans made or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

The researcher used the synthesised model (see fig. 2.1) throughout data collection and data analysis, which was derived through combining the three models of participation that were introduced in the literature review. The synthesised model was used as a tool throughout data collection to guide the observations that were carried out of the two primary events that took place for each case as part of the ASR process. The synthesised model was then used to guide the directive content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and determined the categories that were used for the coding of the data. When thematic analysis was carried out on interview data, the synthesised model was used as a reference tool when considering themes that were being identified during the analysis process.
The following research questions (with associated propositions in italics underneath) were constructed for the research:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?
   
   a) ASR processes are designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   
   b) The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is determined by adults.
   
   c) Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have a negative impact on them.

2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?
   
   a) Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, some of which could be described as ‘facilitators’ for participation.
   
   b) CYP may offer invaluable insight into what helps them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it.

3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?
   
   a) The participation of CYP with SEBD will consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   
   b) Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when they make any decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR.
   
   c) CYP will be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

Propositions made by the researcher are included to demonstrate what the researcher believed would happen based on the findings from the comprehensive literature search that was carried out. Propositions are part of the case study design described by Yin (2003), which is the design of study that was selected by the researcher. As stated by Yin (2003), “each proposition directs attention to something that should be examined within the scope
of study” (p. 22). Yin (2003) argues that although the research questions identify what the researcher is interested in answering, these questions are not adequate in themselves to indicate what the researcher should study. The propositions therefore help to establish what was guiding the researcher when exploring the data, in consideration of ultimately answering each individual research question.

3.3 Philosophical Considerations

3.3.1 Epistemology

The researcher proposed this research project from an epistemological position of critical realism. According to Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor & Tindall (1999) as a critical realist the researcher would strive to carry out intensive study of particular cases to produce an adequate account of the phenomenon being studied. Easton (2010) argues that the approach of critical realism in research lends itself well to the case study method, as “It justifies the study of any situation, regardless of the numbers of research units involved, but only if the process involves thoughtful in depth research with the objective of understanding why things are as they are” (p. 119). Easton (2010) proposes that critical realism is underpinned by entities as opposed to variables. Entities provide a focus on the fundamental nature and the capabilities of what is being investigated in the research, whereas variables result in a focus of the measurable properties (Easton, 2010). Furthermore, Easton (2010) argues that entities have causal powers and liabilities; therefore they themselves make things happen.

By approaching the research from a position of critical realism, the researcher aimed to carry out a project with scientific basis through choosing the case study method to carry out an in depth investigation into the social phenomena of the way that CYP with SEBD participate in planning, decision making and review of their needs in the ASR. Research methods, including observation, interview and analysis of relevant documentation, were selected by the researcher as a critical realist to ensure that they would connect with people’s ability to reflect on and account for their own actions (Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor & Tindall, 1999).
In consideration of the current research, the realist position is evident through the researcher gathering data from observing participation in the way in which it would usually occur in these settings whilst comparing what is viewed to occur with the literature. Furthermore, the critical position is clear through the researcher carrying out interviews with those involved (the CYP and the key adult associated with the ASR) to balance out what could be considered to be a subjective view of participation by the researcher, with how it is viewed by the adult and CYP so that an objective viewpoint is also considered.

3.3.2 Ontology

According to Easton (2010), the author Sayer has given the most detailed and comprehensive account of critical realist ontology in his work. The current researcher as a critical realist acknowledges that the world is socially constructed, however importantly that it is not entirely socially constructed (Easton, 2010). In terms of a critical realist ontology, Easton (2010) argues that the complex stories and explanations that we as humans have given to develop an understanding of the world, can be challenged and destroyed by the ‘real world’ breaking through into that which has been socially constructed. Easton (2010) explains that when carrying out research with a critical realist ontological perspective, “It is not the case that the real or actual cannot be observed but simply that it may not always be capable of being observed. We see just the tip of an iceberg but that doesn’t mean that the invisible three-quarters is not there or is unconnected to what we see.” (p. 123).

It was due to this critical realist ontological position that observational data was gathered alongside documentary data, and semi-structured interviews with the CYP having the opportunity to participate as well as the adults facilitating this process. Observational data alone may not be enough to gather fully comprehensive information to investigate the identified research questions, providing information related to just the ‘tip of the iceberg’. Therefore, from a critical realist perspective it was important to employ additional methods previously stated for data collection to provide a rich dataset allowing investigations to take place regarding how key persons’ views, written data gathered in documentation and the events themselves were connected.
3.3.3 Axiology

Through carrying out an extensive literature review and reflecting on practical professional experience gained through working in the field of supporting CYP with SEN, the researcher found that ASR processes are in place to: support CYP and their needs; to review their progress; to make decisions that will directly impact on them and their lives; and to make plans for their future. The researcher accepts and supports the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF, 1989), therefore promotes that CYP who are the focus of such processes should be invited to reflect on these processes, enabling them to share their views regarding the processes, including: their understanding of the process and its purpose; their participation within the process; and any expectations they have of the process. CYP would therefore be participating in the development of these processes.

When carrying out a research project with a view to recommending a good practice model for facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in ASR processes, the researcher therefore included CYP as participants in the research to give them the opportunity to reflect and share their views on the process and their participation in it. If the researcher believed that the views of CYP were not relevant to a statutory process, which would involve important decisions that adults would ultimately be accountable for, then perhaps the researcher would not involve CYP as participants in the current research project and the focus would steer more towards the views of adults within the process.

3.4 Design of the Study

3.4.1 Case study design

Yin (2003) stated that “case study as a research strategy comprises an all-encompassing method covering the logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis” (p. 14). Something that is suggested to distinguish the case study design method from other research methods is the aim to include the contextual conditions in which the research is taking place (Yin, 2003). It was suggested by Yin (2003) that a case study design method would be chosen with the belief that contextual conditions might be particularly significant to the primary focus of the research.
The current research adopted Yin’s (2009) model of case study design, to investigate the participation of CYP with SEBD in decision-making, planning and review as part of the ASR process, through gathering their views and experiences in addition to information from a relevant staff member and observations of the process. An embedded multiple case study design was used and included individual case studies of participation in the ASR of three CYP (see fig. 3.1 for a diagrammatical representation). Two case studies were carried out in the context of resource based provision for CYP with SEBD, for primary aged pupils (5-11 years). The remaining case study was carried out in the context of special provision for CYP with SEBD for pupils aged from 5 to 16 years. The units of analysis in each case (CYP) were identified as their participation in the preparatory meeting and documentation, their participation in the ASR meeting, and their reflection on their participation and the ASR process after the ASR meeting (see Fig. 2.1 for diagram). The multiple embedded case study design was intended to be exploratory, due to the lack of research and literature within this specific area of participation of CYP with SEBD in formal processes such as the ASR.
Fig. 3.1 Multiple case study design, adopted from Yin (2009)
Yin (2003) explained that a multiple case study design should work in a similar mode to multiple experiments, and whether this will be to produce contrasting or similar results by carrying out study with more than one case, this must be stated explicitly prior to investigation. In carrying out a multiple case study design, the researcher gathered data from each case that would produce findings that were similar in their nature, to provide a wide range of information in answer to the specific research questions. However, it was acknowledged that there would be differences between the individual cases as part of the multiple case study design, due to individual differences, abilities and needs. Differences could also be predicted between the different contexts of resource based and special provision, which according to Yin’s (2003) view of case study research would be likely to have an impact on the case and perhaps result in differences between the two contexts.

### 3.4.2 Case study protocol

Yin (2003) insists that having a case study protocol is essential to support the case study procedure in a research project, and the purpose is to significantly increase the reliability of the research design, as well as intending to guide the researcher in carrying out the case study method. See table 3.1 for full details of the case study protocol that was used to guide the current research.

#### Table 3.1 Case study protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of case study research</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Multiple case study overview | • The participation of CYP in decisions affecting them is high on the political agenda.  
• CYP with SEN in the form of SEBD continue to be under-represented in the literature with regard to their views on participation.  
• CYP with a statement of SEN must be formally reviewed on an annual basis (the ASR).  
• The current research investigates how CYP with SEBD participate in the ASR, particularly in aspects of review, decision-making and planning around their individual needs. |
| Design                      | • Multiple embedded case study design intended to be exploratory  
• Four individual cases (CYP) – resulted in three individual cases (CYP) after unsuccessful interview with fourth CYP  
• Two CYP were investigated in the context of a resource based provision for CYP with SEBD  
• Two CYP were investigated in the context of a special |
provision for CYP with SEBD – only one CYP was included from special provision after unsuccessful interview with fourth CYP

• Units of analysis were each CYP’s participation in the preparatory meeting, their participation in the ASR meeting, and their views on their experience of the ASR process

**Case study procedure**

• A detailed risk assessment and contingency plan was developed to support the case study procedure, full details can be found in table 3.7.

**Case selection**

• Purposive sampling was used to select provision and participants

• Criteria for educational provision were: an organisation providing specialist education and support for CYP with SEBD recognised by a statement of SEN in the Epton local authority.

• Criteria for school staff participants were: a member of staff within the provision who would have a key role in the majority of the ASRs

• Criteria for CYP participants were: a statement of SEN and a primary need of SEBD; an ASR that was planned to take place during the proposed data collection period (resource based provision, April – July 2012; special and alternative provisions, September – December 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data gathering</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Data gathering methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1        | • Semi-structured interview with adult school staff member (SENCo)  
                 • Collect any general documents relevant to the ASR process e.g. ASR meeting agenda |
| Phase 2        | • Observation of the preparatory meeting  
                 • Collect any documents specific to the current ASR process e.g. ‘My Review’ worksheet |
| Phase 3        | • Observation of the ASR meeting  
                 • Collect any documents specific to the current ASR process e.g. record of the ASR meeting |
| Phase 4        | • Semi-structured interview with the CYP |
| Phase 5        | • Collect any documents related to outcomes of the ASR meeting |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Data analysis method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1       | • Full verbatim transcript  
                 • General process documentation | • Thematic analysis  
                                                                 • Content analysis (directed) |
| Phase 2       | • ‘Running record’ of events – written notes  
                 • Completed ‘My Review’ worksheet | • Content analysis (directed)  
                                                                 • Content analysis (directed) |
| Phase 3       | • ‘Running record’ of events – written notes | • Content analysis (directed) |
| Phase 4       | • Full verbatim | • Thematic analysis |
### 3.5 Sampling and Participant Recruitment

#### 3.5.1 Overview

The researcher used a purposive sampling technique to identify the appropriate educational provisions to be approached and then invited to take part in the research. The purposive sampling technique was then used to gather participants who could take part in the research and provide qualitative information to inform the proposed research questions. The researcher aimed to investigate how CYP with SEBD attending special and resource based provision were enabled to participate in the ASR process, so that they could be involved with decision-making, planning and reviewing their needs. Further to this the researcher aimed to find out what worked best in facilitating participation for these CYP at this particular time, and how well the processes that were in place to facilitate participation worked to include the views of CYP with SEBD in the outcomes of the ASR process.

#### 3.5.2 Sampling of provision

It was known to the researcher that in Epton, CYP with a statement of SEN for SEBD were likely to be most highly populated in specialist settings as opposed to mainstream (communication with colleague in the SEN Assessment and Monitoring Team in Epton, November 2012). At the time that the research was carried out, the researcher found that there were 34 CYP in mainstream provision (11 in primary, 23 in secondary), 75 CYP in special provision (18 in primary, 57 in secondary), 6 pupils in a pupil referral unit (primary), and 21 CYP in alternative provision (secondary) (SEN Assessment and Monitoring Team in Epton, November 2012). Out of the special provision available for CYP with SEBD in Epton, the researcher viewed the primary provision with a resource base for CYP with SEBD, the special school for CYP with SEBD (aged 5-16), and the alternative provision for CYP (aged 14-16), to be the most appropriate to invite to take part in the research.
This was due to CYP attending these provisions on a more permanent basis than at the pupil referral unit; therefore they would be more likely to hold the ASRs for CYP. Those CYP attending the pupil referral unit usually do so on a temporary basis, therefore ASRs would be less likely to occur.

The overall research aim was to provide a good practice model for participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process, by gathering data from CYP, school staff and the ASR process itself for each CYP. The researcher approached the study with an understanding and expectation based on professional experience that the population in specialist provisions for CYP with SEBD, in Epton and further afield, would consist predominantly of boys. The researcher set out to inform the research questions using a sample that was representative of this population; therefore the researcher accepted that it would be satisfactory to obtain a predominantly male case study series through the method of purposive sampling. However, as the population of CYP with SEBD in specialist provision is not exclusively male, if female CYP meeting the criteria for participation had been available at the time of purposive sampling the researcher would have prioritised a female CYP over a male CYP to invite them to participate in the research.

Due to professional experience and informal information gathering with colleagues within the educational psychology profession, it was felt that specialist organisations for CYP with SEBD would have a certain level of expertise in their work, in comparison to mainstream settings. This viewpoint was also taken into consideration when making a decision regarding where to carry out the current research. It was felt that adults and CYP in specialist provision would be most helpful to the current research, due to the majority of their students having SEBD and a statement of SEN. Therefore specialist provision would have experience of carrying out ASRs with these CYP frequently and on a regular basis. Investigating current practice in specialist provision would provide the researcher with up to date information about how CYP had the opportunity to participate with the ASR process, and the researcher aimed to provide helpful information for future practice by informing those taking part of the findings of the research. The researcher aimed to use the knowledge generated from the research to make a contribution to recommending ways to develop practice when involving CYP with SEBD in decision-making, planning and review aspects of the ASR process. Hence, the researcher argues that gathering information from specialist provision could be most helpful in achieving this.
The purposive sampling technique was used to locate organisations with specialist provision for CYP with SEBD. The criteria for locating applicable schools were: an organisation providing specialist education and support for CYP with SEBD recognised by a statement of SEN in the Epton local authority. As previously stated, provision that was identified to meet this criteria were a primary provision with a resource base for CYP with SEBD, a special school for CYP with SEBD (aged 5-16), and an alternative provision for CYP (aged 14-16), based on the permanency of the school population. The HT of each of these provisions was approached initially by email and telephone, and then a meeting was arranged for the researcher to provide comprehensive information regarding the research so that they could then be invited to take part.

Initially, the HTs from two of the three provisions (alternative and resource based provisions) agreed to take part in the research. However, the HT from the special provision declined on the basis of CYP being recruited as participants in the research. Following a period of difficulty in recruiting CYP to take part from the alternative provision, the researcher went back to this special provision and approached the newly appointed HT who then agreed to take part in the research. It was evident to the researcher once they had commenced work in the special provision, that the SENCo’s involvement in ASRs had been a recent development in her role. Prior to the current HT being appointed, it was the previous HT who took sole responsibility for the ASRs. On reflection of the refusal to take part by the HT in post when the initial invitation to take part was given, the researcher later found through discussion with the SENCo that the special provision were in the very early stages of developing the ASR processes to facilitate the participation of CYP.

After they agreed on behalf of the school to take part in the research, each of the HTs across the three provisions directed any following liaison regarding the research to take place with the staff member working as SENCo. The researcher then worked with each SENCo using purposive sampling methods to identify the most relevant adult to take part in the research.

In each provision, firstly the researcher informed the SENCo of the research project (providing they did not have this information already), including who would be required to take part and why, and what would be required of each prospective participant. Then purposive sampling techniques were employed to identify the most appropriate staff
member to take part. The criteria to consider when identifying an applicable member of staff were: a member of staff within the provision who would have a key role in the majority of the ASRs. It could therefore be assumed that this staff member held up to date knowledge and information regarding the processes in place for ASRs and how participation was viewed as a general concept within the provision as well as within the ASR process. In each of the provisions it was the SENCoS themselves who were identified as the most appropriate prospective participants to be invited to take part, as it happened to be within their job role to organise, attend and usually chair the ASRs for the CYP. Once this was established, the researcher provided prospective adult participants with a detailed and comprehensive information sheet regarding the research and their role in the research as a participant should they agree to take part (see appendix B). They were asked to confirm their decision to take part in the research using the consent form provided (see appendix C).

3.5.3 Sampling of participants

Next, the researcher and SENCo worked together to identify prospective participants amongst the CYP attending that provision. Largely the researcher guided the SENCo in identifying CYP who would be appropriate to take part, by providing them with the criteria for prospective participants. The criteria to identify individual CYP as prospective participants were CYP with: a statement of SEN and a primary need of SEBD; an ASR that was planned to take place during the proposed data collection period (resource based provision, April – July 2012; special and alternative provisions, September – December 2012). After discussing individual CYP as prospective participants, the SENCo then approached the identified CYP and their parents to inform them about the research and invite the CYP to take part. Although the SENCo at the alternative provision took part in the semi-structured interview, the SENCo reported great difficulty in identifying CYP who were willing to take part in the research. Due to time restrictions, the researcher did not continue to attempt to recruit participants from this provision and did not include any of the data that was collected from the SENCo in the current research.

All CYP who were invited to take part in the research were provided with an information sheet to explain the research and what would be expected of them as a participant. CYP received a child-friendly invitation (see appendix D), whilst their parents/carers received a
more detailed information sheet (see appendix E). Each participant was required to give informed consent to take part, which was given by CYP and their parents through use of a detailed consent form (see appendix F). In the special provision, the CYP whom the SENCo approached with information regarding the research and an invitation to take part, requested further information from the researcher. Therefore, the researcher visited the school to meet with the three CYP to give them further explanation regarding the research, what it would entail, and answer any questions they had. The three CYP were then agreeable to taking part in the research. The researcher required only two participants from each provision. The way in which the two participants of the three available in the special provision were selected was based on when their review took place, with the first two reviews being selected due to time limitations. The CYP who agreed to take part but was not selected received an explanation regarding why this was the case, and was thanked for his willingness to participate.

3.5.4 Participant information

In total, two CYP from the resource based provision gave consent to taking part in the research, whilst three CYP from the special provision gave consent to their participation in the research only two were selected as participants. Altogether, there were four CYP who initially took part in the research, as this was all that was required and estimated to be manageable in terms of the amount of data that would be produced. However, the interview carried out with the fourth participant in special provision was considered not to be successful, therefore the data for this CYP was not included in the findings. The three resulting participants to be reported in the current research project were male, with two participants in Key Stage 2 (KS2) selected from the resource based provision and one in Key Stage 4 (KS4) selected from the special provision. As in accordance with the criteria, each participant was in receipt of a statement of SEN for SEBD.
3.6 Data Gathering Methods

3.6.1 Overview

The researcher set out to use a multiple case study design to answer three research questions, investigating current practice in special and resource based provision with regard to the participation of CYP with SEBD in the planning, review and decision-making aspects of the ASR process around their needs. The researcher predicted that organisations providing special and resource based provision for CYP with SEBD would have existing processes in place for carrying out ASRs for individual CYP. Hence, the researcher planned to use a multiple case study design to explore these already existing processes within both organisations.

To develop a rich picture of data to formulate comprehensive answers to the three research questions, the researcher used three different methods of data gathering for each individual case in the multiple case study design, which is referred to as ‘data triangulation’ (Patton, 1987). The three methods of data gathering carried out for each individual case were: observation, semi-structured interview, and review of documentation. Each of these data gathering methods were focused on collecting data in relation to the participation of each individual CYP in their ASR.

In total there were five phases of data collection, with phase 1 being carried out once in each educational provision, then phases 2-5 of data collection being carried out with each individual CYP who was the focus of each case within the multiple case study design (see table 3.2 for a brief description of each phase of data collection and the research questions that each method of data gathering was expected to inform).
Table 3.2 Data gathering methods to be used in phases 1-5 for each case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Data gathering methods</th>
<th>Research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Semi-structured interview with adult school staff member (SENCo)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collect any general documents relevant to the ASR process e.g. ASR meeting agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Observation of the preparatory meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collect any documents specific to the current ASR process e.g. ‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Observation of the ASR meeting</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collect any documents specific to the current ASR process e.g. record of the ASR meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Semi-structured interview with the CYP</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Collect any documents related to outcomes of the ASR meeting</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.2 Phase 1: Semi-structured interview with SENCo and collection of documents relevant to the context

The researcher carried out a semi-structured interview with the SENCo prior to any of the ASR meetings taking place that were to be included in the research. The SENCo would be present throughout the ASR process for each child, which was specified in an attempt to promote validity in the data provided for each individual case. This interview with the SENCo took place once in each provision, as the information to be gathered was largely general in relation to the provision as a whole and not specific to individual CYP, therefore applicable to each individual case for data collection and analysis.

The ‘interview guide approach’ described by Patton (1980) was adopted in the current research. This approach was characterised by the researcher specifying the topics and issues to be covered in advance of the interview, which were then used as a guide when the interview was carried out (for an example of the interview guide used with adult participants see appendix G). When using this approach, the order and working of questions in the course of the interview is dependent on the researcher at the time of each interview. Each interview was recorded using an audio recorder, and the researcher produced a full verbatim transcription of the data using a computer (for an example of a transcript see appendix H). The researcher collected any documents generally relevant to the ASR processes offered by school at this point.
3.6.3 Phases 2 and 3: Observation

The researcher carried out observations of individual preparation meetings prior to the ASR meeting for each CYP, followed by observations of the ASR meeting itself. In these preparation meetings each CYP completed a ‘My Review’ sheet, which was a document produced by the LA to facilitate the sharing of CYP views in the ASR process (see appendix I for an example of the range of ‘My Review’ sheets in use at the provisions participating in the research). For each case a copy of the completed ‘My Review’ document was collected by the researcher and used to inform data collection in phases 3 and 4, as well as to be considered overall in data analysis. For Case C, the researcher was unable to attend the ASR meeting due to a miscommunication during the data-gathering phase, however Child C also did not attend his ASR meeting due to his personal choice. The researcher felt that although she did not have the opportunity to observe how his views were shared by adults during the ASR meeting, Child C’s participation in the preparatory meeting and his views regarding his choice to not attend the ASR meeting were valuable to the research.

Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007) propose that the general purpose of observational research is to have “the opportunity to gather ‘live’ data from naturally occurring situations” (p. 396). Although the ASR process was not necessarily a ‘naturally occurring situation’ itself as suggested by Cohen et al. (2007), it was a process that was already in place and was occurring as it normally would in the special and resource based provisions. The events that occurred in the ASR process however occurred naturally within the situation and circumstances at the time, and therefore provided data to be considered and analysed to later inform the research questions, and firstly used to increase the relevance of questioning in the interviews with the CYP to follow.

The researcher made comprehensive notes throughout each observation as a ‘running record’ of events (for an example of observation notes see appendix J). As suggested by Cohen et al. (2007), the observations carried out in the current research were considered to provide the researcher with a validity check on the data provided during other phases of data collection through documentation and interviews, in addition to informing the research questions.
3.6.4 Phase 4: Semi-structured interview with CYP

The researcher used the semi-structured interview method with each individual CYP following their ASR meeting (for an example of the interview guide used with CYP participants see appendix K). Patton’s (1980) interview guide approach described above was also used with each CYP. At the beginning of each interview the researcher held a structured discussion with the CYP about participation and what that might look like in their school. The researcher suggested activities that may take place in school offering an opportunity to CYP of participation in school processes, including a school council. This took place to ensure there was a common understanding between the researcher and the participant about CYP and participation, and to provide a framework for later discussion regarding this topic of participation that would take place during the semi-structured interview.

Each interview was recorded using an audio recorder, and the researcher produced a full verbatim transcription of the data using a computer (for an example of a transcript see appendix L). Cohen et al. (2007) argue that when interviewing children it is important to understand their differences to adults in their cognitive development, attention and concentration span, development of language, life experiences, their ability to recall, the impact of status and power, and what they consider important. The researcher considered use of visual representations and prompts as suggested by Cohen et al. (2007) to account for these differences, which would vary dependent on age and ability of each CYP, and would aim to support communication. For example, a range of images to display various emotions (happy, sad, frustrated, angry, bored, calm, confused), people (teacher, parent, pupil) or places (classroom, meeting room) may be shown to the CYP, to support them in answering interview questions. The suitability of such communication aids was discussed with each SENCo taking part and it was felt that these additional aids would not be necessary for the CYP who had been identified as participants.

3.6.5 Phase 5: Collection of ASR outcome documentation

The researcher made one request to the SENCo following the ASR meeting in each case with regard to obtaining a copy of the outcome documentation from the ASR meeting.
This was received in Case A only. Table 3.3 shows the documents that were collected in each case for each phase.

Table 3.3 Documents collected during phases 1-5 of data gathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Phase 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource based provision</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ASR meeting agenda</td>
<td>‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ASR LA documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SEBD)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Example of ‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td>‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special provision</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 examples of ‘My Review’ worksheets available</td>
<td>‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SEBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Data Analysis Methods

3.7.1 Overview

The researcher used three methods of data gathering, consisting of semi-structured interview, observation, and review of documents. To analyse these different methods of data gathering, the researcher employed methods of thematic (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Thematic analysis was used with semi-structured interview data with a view to carrying out a detailed, thorough and in-depth analysis of the data provided by individual people. The researcher set out to maintain a focus throughout the research on the CYP participants and their views, which is why the in-depth thematic analysis was used on this data in particular. Content analysis was used with the data sources obtained through observation and collecting relevant documentation throughout each ASR process in each case. See table 3.4 for details regarding the analysis of each data source for each case in the multiple case study design. This section includes description of both thematic and content analysis, followed by a description of the analysis of one case in the multiple case study as an example.
Table 3.4 Data analysis methods for each source of data for each case in the multiple case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of data collection</th>
<th>Data gathering method</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Data analysis method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>• Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>• Full verbatim transcript • General process documentation</td>
<td>• Thematic analysis • Content analysis (directed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Request to SENCo for documentation relevant to ASR process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>• Observation</td>
<td>• ‘Running record’ of events – written notes • Completed ‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
<td>• Content analysis (directed) • Content analysis (directed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Request to SENCo for documentation relevant to preparatory meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>• Observation</td>
<td>• ‘Running record’ of events – written notes</td>
<td>• Content analysis (directed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>• Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>• Full verbatim transcript</td>
<td>• Thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>• Request to SENCo for relevant documents</td>
<td>• ASR outcome documentation</td>
<td>• Content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.2 Thematic analysis

For each of the three cases making up the multiple case study, two semi-structured interviews were carried out. The first semi-structured interview was carried out with the SENCo at the relevant provision to provide contextual information, and this data was then applicable to the case(s) explored within that context. The second semi-structured interview carried out in each case was with the individual CYP. The data from each interview was transcribed in full verbatim and analysed using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006), with all transcribed data saved in electronic form.

Braun and Clarke (2006) describe thematic analysis as “a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within the data” (p. 79). According to this method the researcher plays an active role in identifying the themes when using thematic analysis. Using thematic analysis for the interview data allowed for a deeper analysis in comparison
to using content analysis, which comparatively allowed for a broader analysis of the surface of the documentation and observation data gathered. The interview data was the main source of data to offer insight into individual views of CYP and adults involved in the ASR process to answer the research questions, which was why the researcher gave weight to the data sourced from semi-structured interviews and carried out thematic analysis to obtain rich and comprehensive findings.

3.7.3 Content analysis

Hsieh & Shannon (2005) refer to content analysis as “a research method for the subjective classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (p. 1278). Content analysis with a directed approach (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005) was used to analyse data provided in the documents collected throughout each ASR process that were related to the context and each individual case. The ‘running record’ written notes were data sources produced during observations carried out by the researcher during the preparatory meeting and the ASR meeting for each case. Using a directed approach to analyse the content of the documents (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), the researcher used the synthesised model of participation (see fig. 2.1) to develop the categories that would be used when analysing the data through identifying codes and categorising them accordingly. The data gathered from the documentation and observations was important to provide data to answer the research questions as well as support the validity of the interview data, which is why content analysis was felt to be sufficient to fulfil this purpose through use of this method of analysis.

The researcher felt that through the process of refinery that took place using thematic and content analysis with each case, the findings were able to give an accurate story to contribute to answering the research questions, as suggested to be the case by Braun & Clarke (2006) in reference to following the steps of thematic analysis specifically.

Section 3.7.4 describes the analysis of Case A in the multiple case study as an example of exactly how each case was analysed. This demonstrates each stage of analysis for each case that led to the researcher being able to identify the findings of the research in relation to the research questions outlined in the initial stages of the study.
3.7.4 Description of the analysis of a case in the multiple case study

The steps described throughout section 3.7.4 were carried out to complete the analysis for each of the three cases.

3.7.4.1 Thematic analysis of semi-structured interview data (SENCo)

The researcher analysed each case in the order that the data was gathered. Hence, the first data source to be analysed was the full verbatim interview transcript for the SENCo using thematic analysis in the way that was recommended and described by Braun & Clarke (2006).

Firstly, the researcher familiarised themselves with the data, which occurred through the process of transcribing the data in full, but then more purposively through reading and re-reading the data. Then the researcher began to generate initial codes, which are described by Braun & Clarke (2006) as ‘interesting features of the data’. The initial codes were generated in a systematic fashion as suggested by Braun & Clarke (2006), and recorded as quote notations. For an example of the audit trail from quote notations to resulting themes, see appendix M.

Once the initial codes were complete in the form of quote notations for the entire dataset, the researcher then started the process of collating these initial codes into themes. The researcher began this process by systematically going through each individual initial code/quote notation, and firstly identifying an appropriate initial subtheme for each code. Next, the researcher needed to physically separate each code with its corresponding initial subtheme using scissors, and group the individual sets of data into similar identified initial subthemes. Data grouped into initial subthemes were then grouped together according to commonalities of a main overarching theme. The refining process thereby continued, with the researcher refining the phrasing of the sub- and main themes, condensing the data into sub- and main themes to a point where the story of the data could still be told.

The researcher carried out a post-hoc validity check of the thematic analysis by determining the inter-coder reliability of the analysis with another coder. The coder was a fellow final year TEP, therefore somebody with a high level of knowledge and training in the overall area of working with CYP in the field of educational psychology, in addition to knowledge
and skills in the area of research. After being sufficiently informed regarding the aims of the research and the research questions themselves, the coder was asked by the researcher to highlight what they felt to be relevant passages of data in three pages of the initial transcript and identify initial codes. The coder highlighted five passages of data, which demonstrated 90% agreement with the six passages highlighted by the researcher. The coder was asked to identify initial codes for the highlighted passages. Ten out of fourteen of the initial codes were the same, however following discussion with the other coder they agreed with the fourteen codes initially identified by the researcher. The coder was then given ‘labels’ which were subthemes identified by the researcher, and they were asked to attach each label to the initial codes as they thought appropriate, and this demonstrated 100% agreement. Hence, this exercise suggests a sufficient level of validity in the thematic analysis process that was used in the current research.

3.7.4.2 Content analysis of ‘My Review’ worksheet

After completing thematic analysis on the full verbatim interview transcript from the semi-structured interview carried out with the SENCo, the researcher then moved on to carry out content analysis with a directed approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) on the next set of data which was the ‘My Review’ worksheet. This worksheet was analysed using content analysis with a focus on gathering contextual data rather than individual responses. Hence, the analysis of the ‘My Review’ worksheet was applicable to each case investigated in the current provision.

Eleven categories were pre-determined through use of the synthesised model (see Fig. 2.1), and each category was used as a header in a table to organise the coding of data (see appendix N). After this the researcher worked systematically through the data identifying initial codes, and categorised these codes into those that were already pre-determined. When a code fitted into a category, the researcher placed a ‘tick’ in the relevant place on the table, with most codes fitting into more than one category (see appendix N).

As recommended by Hsieh & Shannon (2005), data that could not be categorised at the time of systematically analysing the data were identified and analysed later to determine whether they represented a new category or subcategory within the analysis. Some codes included data that was irrelevant to the overall theme of ‘participation’ that was used to
establish the pre-determined categories, therefore these were disregarded. However, a new category was formed and added to the content analysis to ensure that the true story given by the data could be reported in full. All cases had the additional category of ‘Participation in the task – facilitated’, as this fitted with each one.

Finally, the number of codes in each category were tallied and totalled to demonstrate the number of codes present in the dataset in relation to each identified category. The resulting table (see appendix O) was then used to tell the story of the data gathered from the ‘My Review’ worksheet used in the resource based provision to gather the views of CYP with SEBD prior to their ASR meeting.

### 3.7.4.3 Content analysis of observation data from preparatory meeting

Next the researcher analysed the data gathered from the observation of the preparatory meeting carried out by school with the child (see appendix J). The ‘running record’ of events taken in the form of comprehensive notes was firstly read and re-read by the researcher so that they were familiar with the data, and then analysed using a directed content analysis approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) following the same steps described in section 3.7.4.2, resulting in 12 categories for coding. Again, the number of codes in each category were calculated to demonstrate the number of codes present in the dataset in relation to each identified category. The resulting table (see appendix O) was then used to tell the story of the data gathered from the observation data from the preparatory meeting carried out to gather the views of CYP with SEBD prior to their ASR meeting.

### 3.7.4.4 Content analysis of observation data from ASR meeting

The researcher followed the same steps outlined in section 3.7.4.2 to carry out content analysis with a directed approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) on the data obtained from the ‘running record’ of events kept by the researcher when observing the ASR meeting. See appendix P for full details on the codes identified in the data and the way in which they were categorised in the same pre-determined categories from the synthesised model (see Fig. 2.1) used in sections 3.7.4.2 and 3.7.4.3.
3.7.4.5 Thematic analysis of semi-structured interview data (CYP)

The next stage of analysis for Case A was to carry out thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) on the data gathered from the interview carried out with the child. The same steps described in section 3.7.4.1 were carried out when analysing this data. By carrying out the steps outlined in section 3.7.4.1 the researcher was able to produce a final thematic map, which was believed to be an accurate representation of the story told by the data and demonstrate the findings from this part of the analysis.

3.7.4.6 Analysis of outcome documentation

When the SENCo in relation to the case being investigated provided outcome documentation, the researcher simply eyeballed the data to develop a basic understanding of the content of the documentation to contribute to the context of the case. From this type of informal analysis a brief qualitative description could be given to contribute to informing that particular case. Outcome documentation was provided in only one of the three cases, therefore eyeballing of data was decided to be a sufficient method of analysis for this part of the data gathered.

3.7.5 Cross-case analysis

Finally, to complete a cross-case analysis the researcher compared the resulting themes of the thematic analyses for each case and grouped them according to the research question that they corresponded to. The researcher also made comparisons between the content analyses for each case, by simply combining individual analysis data for the individual parts of the data: ‘My Review’ worksheet, preparatory meeting and ASR meeting. For details of the outcome of this cross case analysis see section 4.5. Following the completion of the analysis for each of the three cases, findings from each case were identified and followed by a cross-case analysis.
3.8 Critique of Method

3.8.1 Validity and reliability of the research design

3.8.1.1 Overview

According to Yin (2003) there are four research design tests that are common to all social science methods of research and concerned with the quality of the research design. The four design tests commonly focus on: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability. According to Yin (2003) when conducting an exploratory case study such as the multiple case study in the current research, giving consideration to internal validity is not necessary. However, when using the multiple case study method (Yin, 2003), it is suggested that there are a number of case study tactics that can be used as ways of dealing with and responding to the three remaining relevant design tests. See table 3.5 for a representation of the case study tactics identified to support the three relevant design tests to the current research and how they can be supported, according to Yin (2003).

Table 3.5 Adopted from Yin (2003) (p. 34) demonstrating case study tactics for three (of four) case study design tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study design tests</th>
<th>Case study tactic</th>
<th>Phase of research in which the tactic occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Construct validity     | • Use multiple sources of evidence  
                         | • Establish chain of evidence  
                         | • Have key informants review draft case study report | Data collection  
                         | Data collection  
                         | Data collection |
| External validity      | • Use replication logic in multiple-case studies | Research design |
| Reliability            | • Use case study protocol  
                         | • Develop case study database | Data collection  
                         | Data collection  
                         | Data collection |

3.8.1.2 Construct validity

Yin (2003) argues that demonstrating construct validity when using the case study design can be challenging. Critics argue that collecting data through subjective judgements is an inferior method in comparison to a more sufficient operational set of measures. To overcome this critical view, Yin (2003) recommends that researchers must: identify the
specific type of change that is to be studied; and demonstrate that the chosen measures reflect the specific changes that are the focus of the investigation. The researcher developed three specific research questions that specifically identified what was to be explored in this multiple case study. Table 3.2 specifies the data gathering methods employed for each case with the associated research questions that they aim to contribute to. Table 3.4 demonstrates that multiple sources of evidence were sought, which aims to improve the construct validity of the research design, as recommended by Yin (2003). As Yin (2003) points out, the case study design can be advantageous as it gives the researcher the opportunity to use a variety of different sources of evidence.

Yin (2003) recommends that maintaining a ‘chain of evidence’ throughout the research and demonstrating this whilst reporting on the research contributes to determining construct validity. It is stated that the aim of maintaining a chain of evidence “is to allow an external observer - in this situation, the reader of the case study - to follow the derivation of any evidence, ranging from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions” (Yin, 2003, p. 105).

The researcher set out to maintain a chain of evidence firstly by providing the reader with a literature review that was organised to initially introduce the areas of interest, becoming closer to the specific area of study throughout the chapter. This demonstrated a clear progression towards the development of the three research questions, each with propositions based on the literature that had been reviewed. Secondly the researcher gave a detailed account in the methodology chapter of how the research was carried out in the order that it was carried out in. The researcher makes specific reference at this stage to sections 3.6 and 3.7, which refer to key documents clearly demonstrating a chain of evidence throughout data gathering and analysis with Case A, as an example of how each of the three cases in the multiple case study design were carried out. As the reader progresses through the thesis, they will find the chain of evidence to continue, leading on from the current chapter to the findings, also presented in chronological order of data gathering and analysis. The discussion chapter continues to demonstrate the chain of evidence that has been maintained throughout, by bringing together the findings to answer the initial research questions, and highlight the implications for theory and future research.
Finally with regard to construct validity, the researcher worked closely with her research supervisor throughout the entire process, therefore the expertise and guidance received made a significant contribution to improving the construct validity of the research design.

### 3.8.1.3 External validity

In consideration of improving the external validity of the research design, Yin (2003) recommends that replication logic should be applied. In respect of a multiple case study design, such as that in the current research, Yin (2003) argues that use of replication logic would transpire as either literal or theoretical replication. Literal replication suggests that similar results would be predicted for each individual case in the multiple case study design, whereas theoretical replication suggests that contrasting results would be predicted between cases based on predictable theoretical grounds. In the current study, the researcher used literal and theoretical replication. It was predicted by the researcher that there would be similar results across all cases, however contrasting differences would be likely to occur between the varying age groups of participants and the two different contexts of the three individual case studies. By approaching the research design with use of replication logic, the external validity is arguably improved.

Yin (2003) reminds the reader that critics of the case study design would argue that findings from such research would not be generalisable to other individuals, contexts or the wider population due to inevitable small sample sizes. However, Yin (2003) argues that when carrying out a case study, any generalisation of findings is on an analytical basis to link to a broader theory. Hence, in the current study the researcher set out to make any potential analytical generalisations from the current findings to the broader theory related to participation of CYP with SEBD in ASR processes, particularly with planning, review and decision-making around their needs.

Yin (2003) emphasises that often critics referring to the poor basis for making generalisations from case studies are making judgements in the contrast of survey research designs, which are statistically generalisable. As already discussed, the researcher has employed the use of replication logic throughout the multiple case study, which improves the generalisability of the current study according to Yin (2003). Yin (2003) states that for generalisations to be made, findings must be replicated two to three times to determine
whether the findings are supportive of theory, therefore any analytical generalisations are not automatic. Further to this, the CYP and adults who took part in the research were viewed to be fairly representative of their population, therefore the findings are believed to have the potential to provide useful and meaningful information to the wider population in these contexts as well as other specialist provisions for CYP with SEBD.

3.8.1.4 Reliability

According to Yin (2003), a case study protocol aims to guide the researcher in carrying out the data by including procedures and general rules to be followed throughout the research. By incorporating the use of a case study protocol, it is claimed by Yin (2003) that the reliability of the research is significantly increased. For further details regarding the case study protocol, see section 3.4.2 and table 3.1.

To further improve the reliability of the research design, a case study database was created for each individual case as suggested by Yin (2003) in table 3.5. The case study database for each case can be found in table 3.6. Yin (2003) argues that although establishing a database for case studies can be more difficult than in survey research, it is important for the data that has been collected to be organised in a way that would allow it to be inspected by a critical reader to establish how the case study conclusions have been made. This practice clearly improves the reliability of the research design.

Table 3.6 Case study database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Data gathered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A    | • ASR meeting agenda  
• Example of ‘My Review’ worksheet                                                |
|      | • ‘My Review’ worksheet  
• Observation notes                                                              |
|      | • Observation notes                                                          |
|      | • Full verbatim transcript                                                    |
|      | • ASR LA documents                                                           |
| B    | • ‘My Review’ worksheet  
• Observation notes                                                              |
|      | • Observation notes                                                          |
|      | • Full verbatim transcript                                                    |
|      | • None                                                                        |
| C    | • 3 examples of ‘My Review’ worksheets available                              |
|      | • ‘My Review’ worksheet  
• Observation notes                                                              |
|      | • None                                                                        |
|      | • Full verbatim transcript                                                    |
|      | • None                                                                        |

Data gathered in italics was not analysed as part of the research, it was collected to inform data gathering.
3.8.2 Interviews

The data gathering method of semi-structured interview on an individual basis with the SENCo and individual CYP in each provision was chosen to be most appropriate method to gather comprehensive data to contribute to answering the research questions. The researcher gave consideration to individual differences amongst the CYP who took part, in particular regarding their preferred methods of sharing information. For example CYP may wish to share information on an individual basis or as part of a group. Additionally, consideration was given to various methods of communication that CYP might give preference to, for example through verbal and relatively informal conversation, use of pictures, or a combination of these methods. The researcher was aware through professional experience that being invited for an individual interview may be unusual for many CYP. However in consideration of CYP with SEBD attending a specialist provision, the researcher would argue that these CYP were likely to have had experience of being asked to engage in an interview-type situation with an adult. The researcher was careful to consider CYPs’ view of these experiences, and the likelihood of these being somewhat negative due to the nature of their difficulties. The researcher therefore was able to take this into account when planning and carrying out individual interviews.

As suggested by Yin (2003), interviews can be insightful, and as the researcher was able to develop specific areas of questioning the interview could target specific areas of interest. However, there are several disadvantages of this data gathering method that have been highlighted by Yin (2003), including the possibility of bias due to the way in which questions have been constructed, as well as response bias due to the pressures of social desirability. Participants could potentially give information that they believe the interviewer wants to hear (Yin, 2003), which in the current study the researcher was very much aware of. The researcher planned the use of data triangulation as a way of attempting to counterbalance the possibility for this reflexivity, as well as the possibility of bias created by questions constructed by the researcher and through the pressure of social desirability.

Using the interview method was more time consuming for the researcher than other methods as suggested in the literature (Robson, 2002), for example using a focus group to gather information from several individuals at one time. However, the researcher felt that more information could be gathered from individuals on a one to one basis in an interview context than as part of a group. Using the interview method as opposed to the
questionnaire method meant that any questions that participants might have would be answered, and any unclear responses given by participants could be clarified during the interview.

Patton (1980) identified strengths and weaknesses of the interview guide approach that was adopted in this research. It was proposed that having an outline specifying topics and issues to be covered in advance was an advantage of this method, as the resulting data would be more comprehensive than it would be without such a guide (Patton, 1980). The outline would arguably facilitate data gathering, as it would encourage a more systematic approach whilst giving the opportunity to remain reasonably conversational and situational throughout (Patton, 1980). It is argued in by Patton (1980) that this flexible approach would help to put participants at ease and encourage information to be given more naturally and freely. However, Patton (1980) suggested that the flexibility associated with this approach in sequencing and wording could result in markedly different responses from individual participants regarding the same matter. This in turn could potentially reduce the comparability of responses between participants, which was considered by the researcher whilst carrying out interviews with each individual case. However, although all data was gathered to answer the same three research questions, thematic and content analysis were being used to analyse the data, therefore comparisons between individual responses were not necessarily being made.

3.8.3 Observations

As stated by Robson (2002), when carrying out observation as a method of data gathering the researcher has the opportunity to directly see what people do and say in specific events and circumstances. The literature (Robson, 2002) suggests that observational data can complement data gained through almost any other technique. Therefore, by directly observing the preparatory and ASR meetings for each case in the multiple case study, the researcher felt that the data gathered using the observation technique would compliment data gathered from the key individuals involved in addition to the documentation produced regarding the ASR process in each case. Robson (2002) identifies that throughout the literature it is evident that there are often discrepancies between what individuals report in the form of interviews or questionnaires on what they have or will do, and what it is that
actually occurs. The researcher set out to account for this predicted discrepancy by building data triangulation into the research design.

Robson (2002) states that it is important to consider the impact of an observer on a ‘real-life’ event, and emphasises that it is difficult to gauge the exact level of impact which takes place. The researcher certainly got the impression at times that CYP being included in the ASR meeting was made certain to take place with a view to the observation and research being carried out. The researcher felt that their working role in Epton LA as a TEP may have also impacted on perhaps adult participants wanting to give a positive impression of the ASR processes in school and how they occur. This point therefore vindicates the importance of data triangulation throughout the multiple case study even further. This information alone could be misleading if not viewed in respect of all of the information gathered from the individual child and the SENCo.

The researcher, due to the events that were to be observed being school-led, also incurred practical issues with gathering data through use of observation. The researcher experienced several cancellations and events being rescheduled with little notice, which appeared to come hand in hand with the busy nature of the schools that took part. Observations can therefore be problematic in their organisation and time-consuming in their disposition (Robson, 2002). However the researcher felt that the potential for the contribution of the data to formulating comprehensive answers to the research questions significantly outweighed the disadvantages associated and experienced with observation as a technique for data gathering.

### 3.8.4 Methods of recording data

The CYP taking part in the research who were in KS4 expressed some uncertainty about the use of the audio recorder to document their views given during interview, expressing feelings of embarrassment at their voice being recorded. However, when the researcher explained why it was necessary to record the interview and what would happen with the recording they were in agreement to take part. One CYP was concerned that the audio recorder would remind him of previous experience of police station recording methods, however the discrete size and workings of the audio recorder in use put this CYP at ease. Using video recording equipment as an alternative to audio recording equipment may have
resulted in participants feeling decidedly more uncomfortable than by using audio recording equipment, which could be viewed as comparably less obtrusive. The benefits of using video recording equipment to provide non-verbal communication data were viewed to be minimal, and certainly outweighed by the negative impact such recording methods were likely to have on participants’ ability to take part and share their views comfortably. If being subjected to video recording methods participants may not have behaved as they ordinarily would and may not have been as able to be as open or forthcoming as they were when data was recorded using a discrete audio recorder.

The audio recorder used to document the individual interviews captured spoken words and tone of voice, but did not capture non-verbal communication. Making additional written notes regarding non-verbal communication during each interview, rather than using video recording equipment, was chosen to be the most appropriate method to account for this shortcoming of the selected recording method. It was anticipated that the most important outcome of the interviews would be what was said, and so written notes would be sufficient in providing data on any significant non-verbal communication that took place.

In contrast, the preparatory and ASR meetings themselves had an overall purpose of reviewing the individual needs of the CYP and planning for the coming year, therefore the spoken words within the meetings were not felt to be the primary source of data. Therefore, when the researcher carried out observations of the preparatory and ASR meetings for each case, the primary outcome of the observations was anticipated to be individual aspects of these already existing events including environmental factors, verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication, people present and timings of individual attendance, etc.

Due to the identified purpose of carrying out the observations in addition to the fact that the researcher was investigating participation within an already existing process of events, using an audio recorder to document these meetings was not felt to be the most appropriate and efficient way of doing so. The researcher chose to make written notes in the form of a running record of events throughout each meeting, so that the concept of participation could be comprehensively and accurately explored within these already existing events.
Written notes such as those taken during semi-structured interviews and observations in the current study could be considered to be subjective, as the researcher would make them based only on what they saw. However, it was decided that by the researcher working independently throughout the multiple case study research, this would ensure consistency in the perception of events and method of note-taking. The researcher would be judging the events during direct observation, and then analysing the data with the same viewpoint from which they made the notes, which would arguably improve the efficiency and efficacy of the data. The disadvantage of relying on note-taking, specifically during observations, was that there were times when there was a need to record a significant level of data which could be demanding for the researcher and create the potential for missing any discrete forms of data present at these times.

3.9 Timeline

Details of the research in the form of a timeline can be found in table 3.7 below.

Table 3.7 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Develop research ideas and plans and discuss with university tutor and fieldwork placement supervisor</td>
<td>31st December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete draft thesis proposal and submit to university tutor</td>
<td>3rd January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive feedback on draft thesis proposal, make necessary changes and submit to Course Administrator</td>
<td>6th February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compose information letters describing the research for all participants and consent forms</td>
<td>31st January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare materials for the interviews to be held with participants at school</td>
<td>31st January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare all relevant ethical approval documentation</td>
<td>6th February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Append all materials planned to be used in research (e.g. information letters, interview guides) to ethical approval documentation, and submit with thesis proposal</td>
<td>6th February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make preliminary contact to have brief discussions with schools with specialist SEBD provision that may be willing to take part</td>
<td>31st January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend thesis panel</td>
<td>20th February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive feedback from thesis panel</td>
<td>21st February 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following feedback, submit application for ethical approval with relevant documentation 24th February 2012

Data Collection
Provisionally arrange with schools convenient dates and times for the observations and individual interviews to be carried out (on condition that ethical approval is given) March 2012

Provide school with full written information about the research project, inviting them to give informed consent to take part April – November 2012

Provide all individual participants with full written information about the research project, inviting them to give informed consent to taking part April – November 2012

Observations and individual interviews with children and staff participants April - December 2012

Data Analysis
Analyse the data from interviews using thematic analysis January 2013

Feedback to school and participants
Produce a brief summary report of the research that has been carried out in preparation for verbal feedback April 2013

Arrange feedback sessions for relevant school staff June 2013

Provide participants with written feedback June 2013

Write up
Literature review November 2012
Methodology 31st December 2012
Findings February 2012
Discussion March 2012
Give Notice of Submission of thesis 29th March 2013
Submit thesis 3rd May 2013
Viva Prepare for and take part in mock viva 23rd June 2013
Viva 7th July 2013
Final submission Following any corrections that were highlighted, a final copy of the thesis would be submitted 7th August 2013

3.10 Operational Risk Analysis

Details regarding the completed operational risk analysis can be found in table 3.8 below.

Table 3.8 Assessment of risks and contingency plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Level of risk</th>
<th>Contingency plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with recruiting educational provisions to take part in the research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Be clear in proposal to provision about the research, how much time they will need to commit, and what their involvement will entail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Be clear to provision about the benefit for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participants may withdraw from the study | Low | • Keep up a high level of communication with provision using their preferred method, in order to be available to answer any queries from participants  
• Keep to dates agreed with provision and CYP so that the research process remains as smooth as possible for provision and CYP  
• Contact more than one educational provision that meets the criteria to take part |
| Low response from participants who are invited to take part in the research | Medium | • Be clear in the information sheet to participants about their involvement and what would be required from them on their agreement to take part  
• Make clear to participants the potential benefits of the research if they agree to take part  
• Offer further information should participants request this from the key liaison staff member  
• Contact more than one educational provision that meets the criteria to take part |
| Difficulties in recruiting CYP as participants from all educational provision in the LA | Low | • This study may then have to rely on staff views of CYP views and experiences of participation in order to inform the research questions  
• Could offer CYP alternative options for participating in the research, such as taking part in a focus group or via questionnaire, if the data gathering method is what is causing them to decline their involvement |
| CYP and school staff may be unreliable when they are expected to attend for their ASR preparation, ASR meeting and interview session | Medium | • Ensure dates and times of data collection are negotiated with provision so that they are more likely to be arranged at an appropriate time for optimal attendance  
• Ensure CYP and staff are given enough notice of date and time, they are made clear of the venue, and are given appropriate reminders for their ASR preparation, ASR meeting and interview session  
• Ensure CYP, parents and staff are given |
| Information on who to contact and when, should they need to rearrange any of their agreed appointments • Ensure contingency dates are kept available to provide researcher, parents and staff with time to complete interviews at a later date if necessary |
|---|---|
| CYP may not engage in interview to the level that would be required to provide comprehensive data | Medium • Discuss reasons for why this may be in write up, and use the remaining data from the observations and documentation for analysis |
| The CYP taking part in the interview session may become emotionally charged dependent on individual differences, needs and events that may have occurred prior to the interview or are due to occur that are out of the researcher’s control | Medium • Be alert to tensions and difficulties that arise during the session, and guide the individual CYP in becoming more calm and then if appropriate moving on wherever possible |

### 3.11 Ethics

The research was planned, carried out and reported in accordance with the ethical guidelines outlined in the University of Manchester’s ‘School of Education: Ethical Practice, Policy and Guidance’ (University of Manchester, 2012a) and the ethical protocol outlined within this document. In addition, ethical guidance set out by regulating bodies, Health Professions Council (HPC 2008; 2009) and the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2009) has been considered throughout. Reference and consideration to the guidance given in the ‘University of Manchester Code of Good Research Conduct’ (University of Manchester, 2012b) and to the Data Protection Act 1998 (HM Government, 1998) were given to establish a medium level of risk associated with the current research. The appropriate forms were submitted and approved by the Research Integrity Committee for Ethical Approval, with the date of receipt of UREC research approval as 27th March 2012. Some of these ethical considerations given are outlined below.

Specific ethical consideration was given to the recruitment of participants, particularly for CYP participants. As the overall aim of the project was to promote a good practice model
for facilitating participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process, it was extremely important to the researcher that the voices of CYP were at the centre of the research. This meant that the researcher needed to recruit participants from what was considered to be a vulnerable group. To address the issue of recruiting participants considered to be from a vulnerable group, all participants were required to give written consent to their participation in the research along with their parent/carer (see appendix F). In addition the researcher sought verbal consent from CYP during discussion prior to any involvement to ensure that they were giving fully informed consent. Participants were made aware that they could withdraw their consent to participating in the research at any time.

Another ethical consideration was given to the level of disruption that taking part in the research might cause to those who had agreed to take part. As the ASR process was one that would occur with or without the research taking place, the researcher proposed minimal disruption to each participant’s usual routine. The researcher worked with the provision to be available on the dates that the reviews were already planned by the provision to take place. To ensure the least amount of disruption possible, the researcher carried out interviews with adults and CYP at the most convenient time for them so that their participation in the research would not result in them missing out on anything considered important by themselves or school staff.

Ethical consideration was given to the possibility of participants (adults and CYP) feeling under pressure to take part in the research. To address this ethical issue the researcher invited the HTs of each provision to take part in the research and provided them with detailed information so that they could make an informed choice regarding their participation on behalf of their provision. To address this ethical issue in particular reference to CYP participants, the researcher worked with the identified key member of staff (SENCo) to identify suitable CYP as research participants. However, the researcher had to give consideration to the extent to which they were concerned about the potential for bias occurring in the selection process through use of this method. The researcher argued that there would be more potential for selection bias towards internal factors rather than external factors, such as the SENCo suggesting CYP based on particular qualities that made them a ‘better’ participant in terms of their ability to engage and the chance that they would give positive feedback regarding the school. This was unfortunately something that the researcher could not necessarily control, however they felt that even if this bias did
occur through selection it was unlikely that these factors would have had a significant impact on the ability of the CYP to donate their authentic views on the subject matter.

Once prospective participants were identified, each SENCo who had an existing relationship with the CYP in their provision approached individual CYP and their parents/carers to invite them to take part in the research. The researcher prepared detailed information sheets for parents/carers (see appendix E), and child friendly information sheets for CYP (see appendix D), that were given to prospective participants along with detailed consent forms (see appendix F). This enabled them to be able to make an informed choice regarding their participation in the research. With the special provision the prospective participants whom the SENCo had approached requested more information regarding their participation in the study, therefore the researcher met with the CYP and gave all of the additional information that they required. Prospective participants were then asked if they would like to participate in the research. In this situation and having met the prospective participants, the researcher felt confident that these CYP had made an informed choice regarding their view to taking part. The researcher felt that in terms of the younger CYP who took part in the research from the resource based provision, they certainly presented as willing to take part in the research and happy to share their views.

The researcher gave consideration to the ethical issue of the potential for participants’ social and emotional wellbeing being affected through participating in the research. The researcher had a high level of experience working with adults and CYP, and was supervised throughout all stages of research development to ensure that interviews were carried out in an appropriate, sensitive, non-stressful, and non-threatening manner, as suggested by Cohen et al. (2007). All interviews with CYP were to be kept to a time limit of 30 minutes or less to ensure minimum levels of stress and maximum opportunity to participate. CYP were given the opportunity to choose to have a familiar adult to accompany them during their interview, which one CYP requested.

Confidentiality and anonymity was guaranteed to all participants throughout written and verbal information provided by the researcher (see appendices B, D and E) and this was reiterated in the detailed consent form (see appendices C and F). It was agreed in the planning and delivery of the research that only the researcher and research supervisor would have access to the research data collected. All CYP were informed that
confidentiality would be maintained unless the researcher had reason to believe that the participant was at risk of significant harm due to information that was gathered through their participation. If this had been found to be the case this would have been a concern related to the safety of the CYP, and the researcher would have followed the necessary safeguarding procedures within the school to protect the CYP.

Careful and systematic ethical planning in accordance with the guidelines and protocol given by the University meant that the current study could be carried out efficiently and professionally. Through the process of being granted ethical approval the researcher was required to consider the research design in specific detail, accounting for the range of possible challenges that have been discussed in this section.
Chapter 4 - Findings

4.1 Chapter Overview

The multiple case study consisted of three individual cases, each of these were analysed separately. The findings for each case are presented in chronological order of which the data was collected. Findings from each case are reported successively, and the report of findings from each case is concluded with an individual summary.

4.2 Case A: Child A at the Resource based Provision

4.2.1 Research questions

The following research questions (with associated propositions in italics underneath) were constructed for the research:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?
   
   a) ASR processes are designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   
   b) The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is determined by adults.
   
   c) Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have a negative impact on them.

2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?

   a) Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, some of which could be described as ‘facilitators’ for participation.
   
   b) CYP may offer invaluable insight into what helps them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it.
3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?

   a) The participation of CYP with SEBD will consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.

   b) Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when they make any decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR.

   c) CYP will be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

The researcher wishes to make reference to the above research questions and propositions for the reader to bear in mind when considering the findings for Case A.

4.2.2 Case A: Contextual data from interview with SENCo A

4.2.2.1 Thematic map for contextual data gathered from SENCo A

The contextual data provided by SENCo A is relevant to cases A and B, as they occurred in the shared context of the resource based provision. See fig. 4.1 for a diagram representing the final thematic map for data gathered from SENCo A. The map is then presented in parts focusing on individual themes throughout section 4.2.1 (see fig. 4.2-4.5).
Fig. 4.1 Final thematic map representing main and subthemes in contextual data for cases A and B collected during interview with SENCo A
4.2.2.2 Main theme: Adult-directed ASR process

Fig. 4.2 Thematic map for main theme: Adult directed ASR processes

SENCo A reports that one of the adult-directed processes is ‘information sharing’ for the ASR. SENCo A arranges the time and place of the ASR meeting, and invites all relevant people to attend. The sharing of information before, during and after the meeting is organised and carried out by SENCo A, therefore the organising of the ASR process is significantly adult-directed. SENCo A is responsible for requesting any information prior to the meeting that would be used to support decision-making, as SENCo A shared, ‘We invite all the relevant professionals to the annual review… we then take reports off anyone who is involved with the child’.

The drive for ascertaining the views of parents and CYP was clear, for example SENCo A shared, ‘We also chase up the parents comments. Because you see, those don’t tend to come in. But the Local Authority is very keen to have the parents’ comments. And obviously the children’s report as well’. SENCo A determines what information is shared and when during the meeting, ‘We have a formal agenda for it, with the teacher’s report, the parents’ comments, any other agency’s comments... The teacher has always done a pre-review report, and that’s always attached with the outcome documentation’.

The information gathered throughout the ASR process for each CYP is included in the outcome documentation and submitted to the LA. Information sharing with CYP
regarding outcomes of the ASR meeting does not formally occur. SENCo A assumed that CTs would share any relevant information or outcomes of the ASR meeting informally with CYP.

According to SENCo A, CYP do not have the opportunity to participate in the ‘review, planning and decision-making’ aspects of the ASR, as SENCo A shared, “No… they review their IEPs in class. So they do have involvement in reviewing their IEPs with their teacher, and their targets… But they don’t actually go through it in the [annual statement] review”. Adults are clearly the most influential in the ASR process, with the LA viewed as most influential in planning when giving consideration specifically to the transition review. The LA and the EP are viewed to be particularly influential in reviewing the progress of complex cases. The CT is viewed as most influential in reviewing CYP’s routine progress.

SENCo A gave consideration to ‘developing participation of CYP’ during the interview. SENCo A discussed practical ideas such as providing refreshments for CYP, however felt that she was “just on a mission sometimes to get things done” which prevented such things happening. Another suggestion for improvement was making changes to include CYP in reviewing their progress.

“If we did the process of reviewing their IEP targets, we do that three times a year, but if we did it just before their annual review as well, then they could bring that in, and say these were my latest targets year and I have done X, Y and Z. That would be probably more use than some of that [review worksheet]. It would be a bit more specific… That would be more influential. It just gives more detail”.
There were a number of ‘influences on decision-making’ identified by SENCo A. The perceived size or type of decision was of high importance when considering decision-making as part of the ASR. SENCo A made frequent references to the ‘transition review’, which would be the focus in Years 5 and 6 for pupils in the resource based provision.

“*He’s got this chance now if he can hold it together he could go mainstream. But the choice of mainstream school would be very significant really. Because it’s got to be a mainstream school that’s prepared to deal with the rough times. It’s a massive decision.*”

Hence, the nature of difficulties associated with CYP with SEBD was another of the factors identified to be influential in the decision-making process in the ASR meeting. Such ‘complex’ difficulties were associated with ‘difficult’ decision-making and planning, due to perhaps the unpredictable nature of behavioural outbursts and incidents that could have a significant impact on opportunities for future provision.

Another factor to be considered is the availability of provision and resources, which is understandably influential over decisions made during the ASR process. For ‘smaller’ decisions such as target setting, it was school staff who would be most influential. According to SENCo A, “*Our parents tend to go with what the teacher suggests. It’s the type of*
parents that we have here, they’re not usually I want her to target this or that, they really hand that over to
the professionals”. There was no mention of CYP having any influence in any decisions made as part of the ASR process.

The way in which SENCo A discussed CYP participating in their ASR meeting suggested that if there is a positive relationship between the school and individual CYP this would influence decisions that adults make for them. For example “… it’s going to be a difficult one… a difficult decision to make. He’s doing very well integrating into our Year 5 class now, and we’re hoping he’ll go full time in Year 6. But if he has any behavioural incidents next year, really it’s going to be a hard one to persuade a mainstream high school to take him. Because he does go when he goes... But he’s doing really well, touch wood, it would be the making of him. Because he wants to do well”. SENCo A’s hopes and aspirations for individual CYP were felt by the researcher to influence decisions made about them.

SENCo A described the presence of CYP at their ASR meeting as being influential over the decision-making process, as she stated “it’s important to see the child themselves rather than the information on a piece of paper”. This was acknowledged particularly in reference to LA professionals who ultimately hold the power in decision-making within this statutory process. It was clearly important to SENCo A for CYP to have the opportunity to give professionals and parents a positive impression of themselves. For example, “I think it’s very good for the other professionals to see the child. Sometimes the person from the Local Authority has never met the child, so it gives them an instant visual picture of that child, and an idea of their personality. And they’re also seeing them at their best, which is lovely… So then that feeds into the professionals decision-making”.

It was made very clear by SENCo A that ‘CYP [are] informed of decisions made by adults’ in the ASR meeting in the sense that they are not involved in making the decisions. As stated by SENCo A, “We [school] get very involved, we’ve usually had our involvement prior to this stage [ASR meeting]. So really at this point it comes down to the parents view and the provision that the Local Authority has on offer”. The way in which CYP are informed of the decisions made about them was not clear. However it would seem that the resulting events essentially happen to them, as SENCo A reported there is no process in place to feed back to CYP on what was decided in the ASR meeting.
It was acknowledged by SENCo A that by the time CYP reach the final stage of primary school they usually have an opinion about where they would like to attend high school. They are generally given the opportunity to share this view with adults as part of the ASR process, as she shared:

“I suppose we do ask them where they’d like to go. But we don’t ever set any expectation in place that we will follow your wishes. It’s more that we will have to see what we can do”, however she went on to say “…placement for high school, if there’s any controversy we don’t discuss it with the child. Because they aren’t really equipped to make the decision”.

SENCo A felt that it would be unusual for a CYP to expect to have any influence over decisions made in the ASR meeting, suggesting that CYP in this resource based provision expect adults to make decisions for them. It was also felt to be unusual for a CYP to have a different choice of secondary provision to their parent/carer. The LA and parents/carers make the ultimate decision regarding future provision for CYP in their ASR meeting at the time of transition.

According to SENCo A there is a specific ‘role of LA in decision-making’, as the LA makes it clear in their processes that the written views of CYP and their parents must be completed and submitted as part of the outcome documentation for the ASR process. For example:

“Yes, and [‘My Review’] is copied and shared with the Local Authority, it’s [CYP] contribution to the paperwork. And the Local Authority, give them their due, they’re very good at chasing it up now. If you don’t send it they ask for it… they ask for parents comments and they ask for the child’s comments… which has happened only in the last few years really…”.

This suggests a sense of importance in gathering these views as part of the process; however to what purpose the views of the CYP are gathered was not made clear. However, it could be argued based on the present data that the views of CYP are collected as a formality, rather than to provide CYP with an opportunity for their views to be heard and taken into account.

SENCo A referred to the LA as having a significant level of power within the ASR process, for example as with any controversial or particularly difficult cases when a disagreement
may have occurred between school and home, additional support from the LA would be sought. SENCo A shared:

“… parents suddenly decide that now is the time that they want their child to move out of special provision, well out of resourced provision, and into mainstream school. So the authorities are saying, well we need to make sure he is going to cope, so we need to get him into mainstream. Even though we don’t necessarily think now is the right time for that child to integrate into mainstream… So they are quite influential at that point”.

4.2.2.4 Main theme: Expected outcome following participation of CYP in the ASR

Fig. 4.4 Thematic map for main theme: Expected outcome following participation of CYP in the ASR

SENCo A hoped for a ‘positive experience for CYP’, as she reported that CYP enjoy sharing their views and are proud to have their voice heard in the ASR meeting. CYP believe their role to be as follows:

“To let everyone know how marvellous they are! … they’re very proud to be in a formal meeting, and having their voice heard… Even though most of them are pretty shy… they don’t over-embellish anything, they’re quite reticent, but they do like it. I think they take pride in it”
Their attendance at the ASR is considered to be the most important outcome of participation for CYP, as it is hoped that ‘CYP develop an understanding of their support system’. As stated by SENCo A, “I think that’s the best thing about it really, that they can see who is supporting them and that we’re all rooting for them really, and trying to help them to do their best, and get them into schools that will support them in the future as well”.

SENCo A felt that CYP attending the ASR is an ‘opportunity to show positive attributes and skills’, and “… it’s nice for the child to be seen in a positive light” when they attend their ASR. This was seen to be not only influential in decision-making (section 4.2.1.3.1), but also viewed as one of the key outcomes of participation in the ASR meeting for CYP to promote positivity for the CYP in that moment. SENCo A shared that “Most of them love coming into the review and saying their bit. They feel secure because they’ve got this [review worksheet]… to go through. And usually the person that they’ve done it with will be there to encourage them”

4.2.2.5 Main theme: Influences on the participation of CYP in the ASR process

Fig. 4.5 Thematic map for main theme: Influences on the participation of CYP in the ASR process

The ‘LA and government’ guidance was found to have a strong influence over ASR processes and current practice in the resource based provision, contributing to the way in which SENCo A currently involves CYP in the process. For example, “Prior to the Code of Practice, really children weren’t involved in their reviews that much to be honest… It was very much
professionals and adults. But with the Code of Practice, this became a bone of contention really, and the Local Authority put together this proforma [review worksheet]."

‘Practical aspects of the ASR meeting’ were identified to influence the participation of CYP in the ASR process. According to SENCo A CYP “normally they just stay for the beginning” of the ASR meeting, and then they leave the adults to continue with the meeting. SENCo A suggested that, ‘Most of them are bored. Most of them aren’t listening in and thinking ‘gosh, why is she saying that about me?’ Most of them are zoning out and looking for something to play with’. Also, when considering past experiences SENCo A shared, “We have in the past had meetings particularly with the EBD children where they’ve stayed in, where there’s been a lot of discussion about behaviour, but not recently… We tend to just keep the children in for the positives really. And then they go out, and the adults discuss all the issues” SENCo A makes several ‘considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting’. These considerations were identified to be parents and family circumstances, the age of CYP, and individual differences for CYP. Overall SENCo A attempts to protect CYP from negative experiences and discussions.

CYP are invited to be present for positive discussion at the ASR meeting, as explained by SENCo A, “We tend to just keep the children in for the positives really. And then they go out, and the adults discuss all the issues”. It was felt that “adults are restricted in how they carry out a discussion if the child’s there”. The way in which adults may discuss the complex difficulties generally associated with SEBD with one another was felt to be different to the way that this would be discussed with CYP, “… any negatives about behaviour, or application to learning… and because the children have complex difficulties, we do try to be sensitive to how we portray them when they are there… Because they’re young!”.

There was a sense of wanting to protect CYP from the impact of being present during negative discussion. The SENCo reported that it feels difficult to give negative feedback whilst the CYP is present in the ASR meeting:

“… sometimes with the older ones I suppose we do keep them in for the teacher’s report, but… it’s very difficult… it’s fine while you’re doing all your positives, but we do try and obviously include the difficulties the child has, and we don’t really want to just read that out in that forum with the child there, so we tend not to do that”.
SENCo A explained that the presence of a parent can be advantageous and facilitate participation for example, “sometimes the parents say something to include them. So that’s nice”. However SENCo A has to consider the potential reaction of parents to their CYP in the ASR meeting, “The difficult thing is knowing how the parents are going to react in the context as well… you often want to explain to the parents, whilst these are the negatives, what we need the parents to do is encourage them… what we don’t want is the parents to be telling them off… in front of you”. To avoid this CYP are generally not invited to be present when this conversation and discussion takes place between the adults at the ASR meeting.

SENCo A explained that when planning the participation of CYP in their ASR review she gives consideration to her knowledge of the family circumstances and relationship between the parent and CYP, for example “… be’s not that happy or relaxed to talk in that situation, in front of the parent”. If school could predict a negative outcome of parents and CYP attending the ASR meeting when CYP were sharing their views then this would influence their decision on how the CYP would participate in the process.

The age of CYP was another factor that SENCo A would consider when planning the participation of CYP in the ASR process, as explained by SENCo A, “I think there’s probably an age where it’s not very effective for them participating. I mean, they can all participate in their own way and let you know how they’re doing… and maybe their targets”. However, when discussing the issue of exposing CYP to discussion of issues, SENCo A reported “I can imagine it’s different at Secondary”, suggesting that older CYP may be better equipped to cope with such situations.

SENCo A gives consideration to individual differences of CYP when planning their participation in the ASR meeting in particular, such as how willing the CYP was viewed to be to share their views in front of adults at the ASR meeting, their level of understanding in general, and consequently their perceived ability to take part in the ASR meeting. Factors considered to influence a CYP’s ability to take part in the ASR meeting included their personality, nature and confidence. SENCo A described the importance of considering the emotional state of individual CYP at the time of the ASR meeting, as “… for some children, if they are in a very pressured home situation, sometimes it’s actually quite difficult for them to come to the review and speak in the way that they might have spoken to us in a one to one situation”. The researcher suggests this may impact on the CYP’s ability to cooperate in the ASR meeting
and give others a positive impression of themselves, which was something that SENCo A strived for in her plans for participation of CYP.

Factors identified as ‘facilitating the voice of the child’ were identified by SENCo A. In view of the ‘My Review’ worksheet, SENCo A stated “They’re alright… I mean, we could probably do better, in a way… we could do more work on getting the children to express their feelings… but it’s very hard for the children, and it’s how much time you’re going to spend on it… so this keeps it quite time efficient… And a lot of our children… it’s how much they can contribute to their review really, you know beyond that they are happy, and that they’ve learnt stuff and who has helped them”

SENCo A explained that a member of staff usually supports CYP to complete the worksheet which can facilitate their involvement, as SENCo A shared, “Having that one to one with somebody that they know and trust. They just enjoy having that opportunity to talk and reflect on what they’re doing… We make sure it’s with somebody they know. Sometimes I’ll do it with them, but only if they’re comfortable and I know them well”. However, SENCo A reported in reference to the ‘My Review’ worksheet, “I think that when they’re preparing it they’re just answering the questions really”, and therefore CYP were not necessarily making a specific connection to the ASR process.

SENCo A reported that the ‘My Review’ worksheet worked as a tool to effectively enable CYP to share their views in the ASR meeting, as “They feel secure because they’ve got this [review worksheet], the proforma to go through”. It was felt that without this tool, or ‘script’ as it was referred to, CYP would find it much more difficult to participate, as described by SENCo A, “If they just came in without anything… I did one recently when a child had not done this, and he just brought his literacy book in. But he was a very outgoing child… normally they’d need that [‘My Review’] as a prompt”. The researcher would argue that preparing CYP to share their views in the meeting by completing the ‘My Review’ sheet beforehand should therefore arguably be considered as an important and meaningful task by staff.

SENCo A felt that CYP were capable of completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet based on their own thoughts and feelings in response to the questions, but “it’s how much they can contribute to their review really, you know beyond that they are happy, and that they’ve learnt stuff and who has helped them”. Hence, SENCo A evidently feels that a more active role for CYP beyond the contribution of their views would be socially, intellectually or developmentally challenging.
Having ‘familiar adults in the ASR meeting’ is viewed to facilitate the participation of CYP in the meeting, for example when considering what helps a CYP to participate in the ASR meeting SENCo A suggested, “… if I know that they’ve done something, or if I’ve seen that they’ve done something that day, I’ll say something about it”. Specifically having the member of staff who supported the CYP to complete their ‘My Review’ worksheet present at the ASR meeting can help the child when sharing their views, as suggested by SENCo A, “usually the person that they’ve done it with will be there to encourage them”. Continuity of the LA officer who is present was also viewed to be helpful in supporting the participation of CYP in their ASR meeting, as explained by SENCo A, “If it’s the statementing officer, if he’s met them before he’ll comment on how they’ve grown or something like that. Such an obvious comment [laughs], but it’s nice for the child to have that continuity”. In terms of younger CYP, it was mentioned that having familiar and loved objects or toys in the meeting could facilitate participation in the meeting by making them feel more comfortable.

4.2.3 Case A: Preparatory meeting

4.2.3.1 Overview of data

Content analysis was carried out on the data collected during the observation of the preparatory meeting with Child A, and on the ‘My Review’ worksheet itself. For details on the number of codes identified in each of the pre-determined categories provided by the synthesised model of participation (see fig. 2.1) for both the ‘My Review’ work sheet and the observational data from the preparatory meeting see table 4.1. For details of individual codes see appendices N and O. The ‘My Review’ worksheet was completed by Child A and B in the resource based provision, and was analysed on the basis of the contextual information it provided rather than the individual responses given by either participant. Hence, contextual findings are reported that are relevant to both cases A and B.
Table 4.1 Findings from content analysis carried out on documentation gathered for Child A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>‘My Review’ worksheet</th>
<th>Preparation meeting</th>
<th>ASR meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Shared with adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3.2 'My Review' worksheet in resource based provision

As demonstrated in table 4.1, the ‘My Review’ worksheet was found to result in participation of CYP that was initiated and assigned by adults. For instance, adults initiated the task of completing the worksheet, and CYP would be assigned to review their progress and achievements during the previous year. There was no evidence of opportunities for
CYP to initiate their participation in this task. However, there was a small amount of evidence to suggest that participation in the task was consulted with the CYP, for example in the worksheet there was an option for the CYP to give additional information, therefore allowing the CYP to choose to share any other views that they wished to. The researcher found the ‘My Review’ worksheet to facilitate the participation of CYP, as the colours, illustrations and font used were viewed to be extremely child friendly and age appropriate for primary school aged CYP.

There was evidence of CYP being given the opportunity to share their views and be listened to, to have their views taken into account, and the worksheet itself was a tool to support CYP to express their views. This was achieved through the simple language used, the specific questions, and suggesting alternative ways for CYP to contribute their views to the ASR process should they wish (e.g. submitting a video). CYP were given the opportunity to be involved in decision-making led by adults through use of the worksheet, due to the inclusion of questions asking for their views to review progress, achievements and difficulties, as well as their views regarding planning for the future.

4.2.3.3 Observation of preparatory meeting

As demonstrated in table 4.1, Child A’s participation in the preparatory meeting was found to be consulted with the TA, for instance as written in the observation record, ‘TA read out most questions, gave prompts to offer a range of responses he could pick from’. The TA initiated Child A’s participation in the task, and as she shared with the researcher, ‘Child A doesn’t enjoy doing this as he hates literacy… Child A’s literacy difficulties can result in angry outbursts’. Therefore this suggests that Child A could have complied with the instructions from the TA and did not necessarily participate through choice. There was evidence of familiarity between Child A and the TA, which helped him to participate and focus during the activity.

The researcher found that the TA listened to Child A’s views, for example as written in the observation record, the TA ‘Used the opportunity to demonstrate Child A’s improvement, and cycle between anger, literacy and asking for help’. Child A was supported in sharing his views, as written in the observation record, ‘TA gave prompts, allowed Child A to give own responses, and encouraged him to respond’. No data was identified in relation to decision-making around the
child’s needs, which was expected, as decision-making is not part of the focus of the preparatory meeting.

4.2.4 Case A: The ASR meeting

The ASR meeting was attended by SENCo A, Child A, Child A’s carer, and TA. Child A attended the meeting for the first 15 minutes of the 45-minute meeting. As demonstrated in table 4.1, participation of Child A in the ASR meeting was found to occur, primarily on an adult initiated and assigned basis. For instance, the length of time that child A attended the ASR meeting was adult initiated, and the information that was to be shared during that time using the ‘My Review’ worksheet was a task which was assigned to Child A. There was evidence to suggest that Child A initiated some of his participation in the ASR meeting himself and he was also participated through consultation with SENCo A. For example, Child A responded to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting by demonstrating how keen he was to share his views regarding secondary placement, interrupting with “I know where I want to go!”. SENCo A allowed Child A to share his view at this point, but came back to this later, therefore a level of negotiation took place. Child A was interested and keen to share his views, and this personal motivation was viewed to facilitate his participation in the process.

There was evidence of the adults present giving Child A time to speak, and evidence of his views being listened to and taken into account. SENCo A also supported Child A in sharing his views through engaging him in brief discussion throughout to extend his answers in more detail.

During the time that Child A was in the meeting, he clearly felt confident and comfortable enough to make a request to the SENCo that he would like to learn Spanish in mainstream provision. Child A had some involvement in decision-making discussions that took place whilst he was there, for example the discussion which then took place with SENCo A regarding the possibility of learning Spanish in mainstream. Child A would ultimately be informed in the decision-making process, as SENCo A told Child A that she would consider his request and a decision would be made (by adults). The majority of ‘decision-making discussion took place once Child A had left the meeting.
After Child A left the ASR meeting, discussion was had regarding plans for secondary provision and plans for integration to prepare Child A for what they hoped would be mainstream secondary school. SENCo A and Child A’s carer made the plan together for the coming months, with both acknowledging Child A’s wishes, desire and drive to attend mainstream when discussing their plan. For example as written in the observation record, ‘SENCo A said “how good it is” that Child A wants to be in mainstream, as this is what school want for him too’. Child A’s carer ultimately shared that she was happy to follow Child A’s choice of provision, and as this was the same as the school’s choice there was no issue or upset regarding making this decision.
4.2.5 Case A: Child A’s views on the ASR process

4.2.5.1 Thematic map of data from interview with Child A

See fig. 4.6 for a diagram representing the final thematic map for Child A. The map is then presented in parts focusing on individual themes throughout section 4.2.4 (see fig. 4.7-4.8).

Fig. 4.6 Final thematic map representing main and subthemes from interview data regarding Child A’s views on his experience of the ASR process
4.2.5.2 Main theme: ASR processes

‘Understanding the purpose of the ASR’ was identified as a subtheme in the data. Child A required prompting and a simple level of explanation from the researcher with regard to developing a shared understanding of the purpose of two of the key parts of the ASR process that were discussed: the ‘My Review’ worksheet and the ASR meeting itself.

Data was identified to form the subtheme ‘evaluation of current practice in the ASR’. Child A gave fairly neutral comments regarding his view of the ‘My Review’ worksheet, reporting that this worksheet was “fine”, with an acceptable number of questions that were easy to answer. It was reported that the one week of notice that Child A was given before their ASR meeting took place was enough time for the child to prepare to attend. Child A felt “fine” about attending the first part of the meeting, and then leaving the meeting as advised by staff whilst knowing that the ASR meeting would be continuing without him. Child A reported that the duration of time that he attended the ASR meeting was an acceptable amount of time for him. It was evident in the data that Child A had been keen to be present for and hear his teacher’s feedback on his progress at school, with Child A commenting that he would have been “disappointed” had he not had this opportunity.
4.2.5.3 Main theme: Voice of the child

Fig. 4.8 Thematic map for main theme: Voice of the child

In consideration of the ‘outcome of having your say’, Child A reported feeling that he was listened to during the time he spent in the ASR meeting, reporting “Yes definitely. My Nan always listens to me”. In discussion with the researcher, Child A agreed that he felt proud of himself after reading out his views from his worksheet, and he thought that everybody there felt proud of him too. Child A claimed that he liked to attend the ASR meeting, “So they know what I think I’ve done best at this year”, and he felt “happy” that he had taken the chance to share his views and for these views to be heard by adults, not simply listened to. Child A reported that he would be “A bit disappointed” if he did not have the opportunity to share his views, which would have a wider impact in school, “I don’t really do my best work when I’m a bit grumpy… and disappointed”. Although Child A found it difficult to elaborate further, he did suggest a sense of importance in his own views, as he felt that having his say “probably will [make a difference]… I don’t know which kind like”.

Four factors were identified as ‘things that help you to have your say’ in the data provided by Child A. Firstly, Child A reported that he felt comfortable to share his views in front of those present at the meeting. Secondly, Child A reported that he was a confident young man, and he felt that this had helped him to be able to share his views, for example he shared “Yeah!... I always feel confident… I’ve done that many shows in this school… I’m always confident”. Thirdly, in reference to the ASR meeting Child A acknowledged that familiar adults being there at the meeting facilitated his participation, for example he said “Teachers, because they make you feel dead confident… and your parents just smiling at you, they make you feel even more confident”. Fourthly, Child A felt that “everyone should have a say”, therefore participating
in such an opportunity that he was given is something that is personally important to this CYP. Child A believed that it was important for school to ask him for his views, and he would feel disappointed if he didn’t have this opportunity. Although Child A felt that everybody should have the opportunity to share their views, he added “Except if they were a baby, they’d have to wait until they were grown up a bit” before they had their say.

Child A made reference to ‘making choices’, demonstrating his ability to develop preferences in terms of his interests at school and where he would like to attend for his secondary education. Child A also independently made a request during the ASR meeting regarding increasing his integration into mainstream that would enable him to be present for Spanish. He shared his choices in the meeting, and was able to give reasons for his choices during the research interview, for example “because I do know a few words in Spanish, but I want to know more”. On reflection Child A was not expectant of the adults to agree to his request regarding learning Spanish, as he shared “I thought she might have said no” and that he was “very, very surprised actually”. Child A reported that this made him feel like he had been listened to.

4.2.6 Case A: Outcome documentation of the ASR

The outcome documentation included the completed ‘parents/carers comments’ sheet, the ‘annual review report’ that had been completed by Child A’s CT, and the ‘My Review’ worksheet completed by Child A. Content analysis of the ‘My Review’ worksheet has been reported in section 4.2.2.2. The ‘annual review report’ was clearly more substantial in its content than both the ‘parents/carers comments’ sheet and the ‘My Review’ worksheet.

Throughout the outcome documentation, there was one reference to decision-making around Child A’s needs, with a brief plan, which was found in the last sentence of the two and a half page ‘annual review report’ completed by Child A’s CT, stating that ‘it is hoped that Child A will use the strategies that he has learnt to manage his own behaviour and anger so that he will be able to integrate into mainstream full time by the end of the year’. The majority of the ‘annual review report’ focussed on reviewing Child A’s progress throughout the last year in detail, referring to behaviour and learning.
Overall in this documentation, Child A’s views were clearly sought and included in the outcome documentation as one of the three views to be considered by the LA. However, there was no clear evidence to suggest what the LA would do with these views, and how much weight each of them held in reality during decision-making, planning and reviewing his needs.

4.2.7 Case A: Summary of findings

4.2.7.1. Summary of contextual findings for cases A and B

SENCo A provided contextual data in relation to ASR processes in the resource based provision which was relevant to cases A and B. According to this contextual data, the ASR is very much an adult-directed process. CYP are generally invited to attend the ASR meeting to share their views, structured by the ‘My Review’ worksheet. They are not invited to attend or take part in the review, decision-making and planning aspects of the ASR meeting. The LA have the overall power in decision-making and parents’ views are most important to the LA in decision-making. A key expected outcome of CYP participating in the process is that they develop an understanding of their support system. Factors that facilitate the participation of CYP and their ability to share their views were found to include working with familiar adults. Overall SENCo A aims to protect CYP from negative experiences when planning their participation in the process.

The ‘My Review’ worksheet also provided contextual data regarding ASR processes in the resource based provision, therefore is applicable to both cases A and B. It was found that participation of CYP in the ‘My Review’ worksheet would be initiated by adults, and CYP would be assigned to each individual part of the task. The presentation of the worksheet was viewed to facilitate CYP’s participation in the task. CYP were being given the opportunity to share their views, and the worksheet, as a tool, would support CYP in expressing specific and relevant views. CYP were being given the opportunity to contribute to decision-making by sharing their views, however how much their views would be taken into account would depend on key adults in the process.
4.2.7.2 Summary of findings for Child A

Child A’s participation in the preparatory meeting whilst completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet was primarily consulted by the TA supporting him. The support from the TA facilitated Child A’s participation in sharing his views. The task was interactive due to the support provided by the TA, therefore Child A’s views at the time were listened to, taken into account, and he was very much supported to express his views. There was no opportunity for decision-making around Child A’s needs at this stage.

Child A’s participation in the ASR meeting was found to be primarily adult initiated and assigned, however he also initiated his own participation and participated through consultation with adults. There was evidence of Child A being supported to express his views, and these views being listened to and taken into account. Child A was a confident young man, and had the ability to make his own choices, therefore he expressed his own views in addition to the ‘My Review’ script. After he initiated the discussion regarding reintegration to mainstream for Spanish lessons, he was involved in some of the decision-making in respect of this. However, ultimately adults would make the decision after the meeting had taken place. The majority of decision-making as part of the ASR took place by adults after Child A had left the meeting, therefore he would be primarily informed of decisions made.

When sharing his views on his experience of taking part in the ASR, Child A found using the ‘My Review’ worksheet to be an acceptable method of sharing his views. He perceived his opportunity to attend the meeting and share his views positively. Child A acknowledged his confidence helped him take part in the ASR meeting. Child A felt positively when reflecting on taking the initiative to share his views, and surprised that SENCo A agreed to consider his request about reintegration to mainstream for Spanish.

On consideration of the final outcome documentation following completion of the ASR process, it was evident that Child A’s views were included alongside the views of his carer, and his CT in the form of the ‘annual review report’. The only reference to decision-making and planning was found in the final part of the CT’s report, which in the main focussed on reviewing Child A’s progress in detail. It was not possible for the researcher to predict what action would occur with Child A’s views, and what, if any, weighting they would have in the final decisions and plans made by the LA on receipt of the
What was clear to the researcher was that school provided the most detailed information that was included in the outcome documentation.

4.3 Case B: Child B at the Resource based Provision

4.3.1 Research questions

The following research questions (with associated propositions in italics underneath) were constructed for the research:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?
   a) ASR processes are designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   b) The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is determined by adults.
   c) Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have a negative impact on them.

2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?
   a) Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, some of which could be described as ‘facilitators’ for participation.
   b) CYP may offer invaluable insight into what helps them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it.

3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?
   a) The participation of CYP with SEBD will consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   b) Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when they make any decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR.
c) CYP will be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

The researcher wishes to make reference to the above research questions and propositions for the reader to bear in mind when considering the findings for Case B.

4.3.2 Case B: Contextual data from interview with SENCo A

See previous section 4.2.1 and fig. 4.1-4.5 for the relevant findings from the contextual data gathered with SENCo A in relation to the resource based provision.

4.3.3 Case B: Preparation for the ASR meeting

4.3.3.1 Overview of data

Content analysis was carried out on the data collected during observation of the preparatory meeting with Child B. For details on the number of codes identified in each of the pre-determined categories from the synthesised model of participation (see fig. 2.1) see table 4.2. Content analysis was carried out on the ‘My Review’ worksheet, which was completed by both Child A and B to provide contextual data, therefore individual comments were not analysed. For details of findings related to the ‘My Review’ worksheet relevant to Case B see section 4.2.2.2.
Table 4.2 Findings from content analysis carried out on documentation gathered for Child B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Child B – Resource based Provision Number of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Shared with adults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences in decision-making</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.3.2 Observation of preparatory meeting**

Child B’s participation in the task was primarily initiated by the TA, for example as written in the observation record, ‘While waiting in class for staff to become available, TA called over “Shall
we do ‘My sheet’ in a minute Child B? How I’m doing?” Child B nodded’. There was no evidence found to suggest that Child B initiated his own participation in the task, however there was some evidence to suggest that his participation in the task was consulted, for example the observation record included a discussion had between Child B and the TA regarding the purpose of completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet. There were a range of factors identified as those that facilitated Child B’s participation in the task, including the welcoming room where the task took place, and Child B being familiar with the worksheet. Child B also had adequate language and writing skills that enabled him to participate in this task.

Child B was supported in expressing his views, primarily through additional support from the TA. For example as written in the observation record, the TA ‘encouraged Child B from the beginning to give detailed answers’. Child B’s attention difficulties were evident throughout the task and there were times when he appeared to be rushing, therefore the TA ‘tried to slow the pace here with calm approach, and throughout kept Child B interested/engaged by following his lead, giving him time and moving on when appropriate’.

During this task Child B’s views were listened to, which was demonstrated by the TA responding appropriately to the views he shared. For example, ‘TA agreed with Child B, prompted him with ideas of how it’s improved’. There was some evidence to suggest that Child B’s views were taken into account by the TA during the preparatory meeting, for example the observation record states that she said to Child B ‘You don’t have to put anything down. But if there’s anything you want to put, that will help me know too how to help you… I bet you didn’t think you’d be helping me!’. However, there was felt to be little opportunity for Child B’s views to be taken into account at this stage in the process. This task was primarily for Child B to share his views, hence there was no opportunity for decision-making around Child B’s needs during this task. Child B could only contribute his views to the specific questions asked that could potentially be used by adults later in the decision-making process.

4.3.4 Case B: The ASR meeting

The ASR meeting was attended by SENCo A, Child B and Child B’s mother. Child B attended the meeting for the first 10 minutes of the 40-minute meeting. For details of the number of codes identified in each category of the synthesised model (fig. 2.1) see table
4.2. Child B’s participation in the ASR meeting was primarily found to be adult-initiated, for example as written in the observation record, ‘SENCo A encouraged Child B to join brief discussion re. Mainstream’. The way that Child B participated and the time that he attended the meeting was assigned by SENCo A, for example Child B was asked to read out his comments on the ‘My Review’ worksheet, and asked ‘if he would like to go and play on the computer’ when it was viewed to be time for him to leave.

Some aspects of the ASR meeting were identified within the category of facilitating Child B’s participation in the meeting, including the length of time that he attended for, as written in the observation record whilst Child B was still present, ‘Child B looking away possibly not engaged anymore’. Having the ‘My Review’ worksheet as a script to share his views was viewed to facilitate his participation, as ‘Child B didn’t answer or say very much’ when asked questions during the meeting.

Child B was supported to express his views, for example ‘SENCo A prompted Child B to share and reflect on reasons why he stopped mainstream’. There was just one occasion that was identified as Child B’s views being taken into account, which was when SENCo A asked Child B about his preference for high school, as she engaged in discussion with him regarding his thoughts around his choice. However, this was the only discussion regarding decision-making that took place when Child B was present.

After Child B had left the meeting, the discussion between SENCo A and Child B’s mother focussed on decision-making. Primarily decision-making around Child B’s needs were categorised as ‘informed’, due to SENCo A and Child B’s mother making decisions, or planning to make decisions, for Child B. Child B’s mother was focused on Child B’s current needs and wellbeing, which was balanced by SENCo A’s experience of such matters. As written in the observation record, ‘Mother concerned re. impact of yet another change… SENCo A concerned with Child B being supported with learning (in base) and being prepared for mainstream secondary’. Child B’s mother and SENCo A decided on a plan with SENCo A taking the lead, and included in this plan was monitoring how Child B coped with the plan they put in place. This appeared to be the only way that Child B would be involved in the decision-making, therefore his behaviour could indirectly influence decision-making. An additional category was added during content analysis for all data identified to be influential in decisions made by adults, including the perceived size of the decision to be made, ‘Mother expressed high concern about decision’, and the sense of familiarity in the relationship between
Child B’s mother and SENCo A as Child B’s mother was happy to accept advice from SENCo A and to trust and follow her lead.

**4.3.5 Case B: Child B’s views on the ASR process**

**4.3.5.1 Thematic map of data from interview with Child B**

See fig. 4.9 for a diagram representing the final thematic map for Child B. The map is then presented in parts focusing on individual themes throughout section 4.3.4 (see fig. 4.10-4.12).

**Fig. 4.9 Final thematic map representing main and subthemes from interview data regarding Child B’s views on his experience of the ASR process**
4.3.5.2 Main theme: ASR process

Fig. 4.10 Thematic map for main theme: ASR meeting

Child B found the ‘My Review’ worksheet to be visually appealing and he liked completing the worksheet “because the picture is football, and I like football”, therefore this was identified as one of the ‘facilitators for participation’. Child B reported that at least some of the questions were easy for him to answer, even though some were considered to be more difficult. When encouraged to reflect on using the ‘My Review’ worksheet as a script in the ASR meeting, Child B shared that he felt “fine” when sharing his views from the sheet, and he confirmed that it would have been “Hard” to share as much as he did if he did not have use of this tool.

Child B confirmed that he viewed it to be important for him to attend the first part of the ASR meeting, therefore the researcher felt that this sense of importance may have facilitated his participation in the process when analysing the data. Child B felt “good” that his mother was at the ASR meeting, and having just his mother and SENCo A was viewed by Child B to be preferable to having any additional people there as questioned by the researcher, “Anybody like your teacher, or your dad, or anyone else in your family or friends?”.

Child B was pre-warned by his mother about his ASR meeting which may have facilitated his participation, and confirmed that the one week of notice that he was given was enough time for him to prepare to attend. On reflection of the time that Child B spent in the ASR meeting, he viewed this to be just right and confirmed he was “Happy to stay there for that amount of time”.

Outcome of the ASR

Facilitators for participation

Potential barriers for participation
As mentioned previously, Child B stated that it was “good” that the ASR meeting had been attended by his mother and SENCo A, shaking his head to suggestions of any others that he may wish to attend. Had these people been invited to attend, Child B would have presumably had a different experience of participation in the ASR process, therefore suggesting this as one of the ‘potential barriers for participation’.

Although Child B shared generally positive views in reference to the ‘My Review’ worksheet, he also found some of the questions difficult to answer, with the most difficult being ‘What help do you think you need?’. Child B stated “I’d never think [of an answer]” when the researcher asked if there was anything that could have been different to help him with these questions. Child B expressed a preference for listening to others present at the ASR review rather than expressing his own views. Therefore, if Child B had been put under pressure to share more or engage in further discussion, this may have resulted in a more negative experience of participation for him. Child B shared that he would prefer not to be present for ‘receiving teacher feedback’ regarding his progress. Hence, this could have also been a barrier to his participation if he had expected to be present for such feedback.

When asked about his expectations regarding the ‘outcome of the ASR meeting’, Child B shared that he was keen to improve his behaviour, stating that “I’m not going to go out of my seat” and in reference to his Year 6 placement he stated that “I’m going to be staying in there”, which the researcher believed to be in reference to the resource based provision as opposed to being reintegrated into mainstream provision.
4.3.5.3 Main theme: Opportunity to share views

Fig. 4.11 Thematic map for main theme: Opportunity to share views

It was evident that Child B ‘valued’ the opportunity to attend the ASR meeting, as he felt “happy” to be asked about his views on secondary school, and he confirmed that he felt SENCo A wanted him to be at the ASR meeting and listen to his views. Child B confirmed he would feel badly if he was not asked to attend his ASR meeting in the future, and agreed that he would like to continue to attend, which suggests that he valued his opportunity to attend the ASR meeting. Child B identified that the views he shared on the ‘My Review’ worksheet were important for his current and future provision to be aware of, as he said “Because the other school where I am going, they might give them it to check how good I’m doing at my handwriting… and staying at my table”.

Child B identified factors involved in ‘making choices’, specifically with a view to high school, as whether his friends would be there, and the types of activities that he would have the opportunity to take part in, for example “And you get to do mountain biking… and tennis, and football”. Child B suggested he felt positive about going to high school, as he shared that he felt “happy” at the thought of going to high school.
### 4.3.5.4 Main theme: Trust in adults

Fig. 4.12 Thematic map for main theme: Trust in adults

The subtheme ‘taking views of the child into consideration’ was in the data, as when the researcher asked “*When they’re thinking about all the different things, do you think that they will think ‘Well, Child B wants to go to Robinson High, so we need to remember that while we’re deciding’?*” Child B confirmed that he felt the adults would take his views into consideration. Child B reported he felt during the ASR meeting that his mother and SENCo A listened to his views whilst sharing his ‘My Review’ worksheet and when discussing secondary provision.

Child B appeared to ‘value the opportunity to listen to adults’. Child B’s trust in adults and the level of higher importance that he perhaps placed on obtaining the views of adults rather than sharing his own in the context of the ASR was evident as he suggested that he would feel “*bad*” if he was not invited to his ASR as he would want to “*listen*”. The researcher checked, “*Would you want to say what you think as well or just listen?*” to which Child B responded, “*Listen*”.

Child B appeared to be agreeable to ‘allow adults to take the lead in the ASR meeting’, as he agreed that he felt “*ok*” about leaving his mother and SENCo A to continue the meeting without him being present. Child B appeared to be more focussed on his opportunity to play on the computer whilst his mother and SENCo A continued with the ASR meeting. Child B reported that he didn’t engage in any further discussion with his mother of SENCo A regarding the contents of the ASR meeting following his departure.
4.3.6 Case B: Outcome documentation of the ASR

SENCo A did not submit the outcome documentation for analysis in the research.

4.3.7 Case B: Summary of findings

For a summary of the contextual findings for cases A and B see section 4.2.6.1.

Child B’s participation in the preparatory meeting was found to be initiated, assigned and consulted by the TA supporting him. Many factors were identified as those that facilitated Child B’s participation in the task, including familiarity with the process. There was evidence to suggest that Child B’s views were listened to and taken into account when possible at the time. Child B was supported to express his views by prompts and encouragement from the TA. There was no opportunity for decision-making around Child B’s needs during the preparatory meeting.

In the ASR meeting, Child B’s participation was found in the main to be adult initiated, however there was some evidence of participation being assigned and consulted. Using the ‘My Review’ worksheet as a script facilitated Child B’s participation in the meeting. Child B was supported to express his views, which were listened to by adults present. Discussion about decision-making took place between the adults when Child B was no longer present, therefore Child B would be primarily informed of decisions made. Several factors were identified as having an influence on the decision-making process, including the perceived ‘size’ of the decision, in terms of the significance of the decision about high school provision and how this could impact on Child B’s life in the near and more distant future.

When sharing his views on his experience of the ASR process, Child B evidently valued the opportunity to share his views as part of the ASR process. When considering his choice for high school, Child B gave reasons for his choice and felt positive about the idea of high school. Factors that the researcher identified as those that helped Child B to participate according to the information he shared, were the time given to prepare and time spent in the meeting, as well as having specific people in attendance at the ASR meeting. Child B found it difficult to share his views in response to some of the specific questions in ‘My Review’, however managed to overcome this barrier with adult support. It was evident that
Child B had trust in the adults involved in the ASR process. Child B felt listened to, and valued the opportunity to listen to others. He believed that adults, who valued his contributions to the process and listened to him, would take his views into consideration when making decisions about his future provision.

4.4 Case C: Child C at the Special Provision

4.4.1 Research questions

The following research questions (with associated propositions in italics underneath) were constructed for the research:

1. In special and resource based provision, how are ASR processes designed to include the participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?
   
   a) ASR processes are designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
   
   b) The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is determined by adults.
   
   c) Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have a negative impact on them.

2. What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?

   a) Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, some of which could be described as ‘facilitators’ for participation.
   
   b) CYP may offer invaluable insight into what helps them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it.

3. In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?

   a) The participation of CYP with SEBD will consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
b) Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when they make any decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR.

c) CYP will be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

The researcher wishes to make reference to the above research questions and propositions for the reader to bear in mind when considering the findings for Case C.

4.4.2 Case C: Contextual data from interview with SENCo B

4.4.2.1 Thematic map for contextual data gathered from SENCo B

See fig. 4.13 for a diagram representing the final thematic map for SENCo B. The map is then presented in parts focusing on individual themes throughout section 4.4.1 (see fig. 4.14-4.18).
Fig. 4.13 Final thematic map representing main and subthemes in contextual data for case C collected during interview with SENCo B
Fig. 4.14 Thematic map for main theme: Adult-led practical aspects of the ASR process

‘Information gathering in preparation for the ASR meeting’ is organised by SENCo B, “I’ve got a letter that more or less notifies [CTs] that a review is going to be in a fortnight’s time… I say I’m going to be collecting this information, is there anything that you feel needs to be added to that, anything you feel that would contribute to the review”. Particular people are identified as those who commonly provide information for the ASR, as SENCo B stated “… parents who have a chance to give their comments, obviously the CT and the teaching assistants who are working with the young person, and the pupil themselves”.

SENCo B highlighted some of the types of information regarding the CYP that are sought to inform the ASR meeting. For example, “… there might have been a medical diagnosis recently that needs to be written into the statement, there may be additional aids and new strategies that have been put into place that support the children, either in their learning or their behaviour, which then enables them to then access their learning”.

SENCo B argued the importance of ensuring the ASR meeting is fully informed, as she shared “It happens once a year… it is important that [the LA] know that the money is being spent appropriately and the support that is being provided is needed and is adequate as well. Because if it’s not, then you can go another twelve months, unless an urgent review is called in between… you could miss something important”. 
The overall ‘focus of the ASR meeting’ is dependent on the age of the CYP, ‘We are a primary and a secondary school, so there’s a different focus with the younger children, and we’re looking at their development really. Once they are older and most of the developmental stages have taken place, quite a lot of it is looking ahead and planning for the future and careers’. However, there are a range of areas covered including attendance, progress with targets, appropriateness of provision, and the possibility of reintegration to mainstream provision. SENCo B explains, “it would be more about what they’d done well, and looking at the positives. But acknowledging that certain situation that they find hard”. SENCo B feels that the ASR meeting is an opportunity to develop a shared understanding between those in attendance, and to share information with CYP, “there’s quite a broad range of information that will go in, and it’s an opportunity for it all to be shared with the different interested parties that are involved with the children. And the children themselves as well, and to see where they are going”. SENCo B views the ASR meeting as a chance to ensure that any choices that parents and CYP are making are properly informed, for example “If it’s looking at alternative provision, again the work based tutor is there and be will throw out some ideas, and he’ll say ‘you don’t have to decide now, but these are the different options that you have’ or ‘what do you think, but you don’t have to decide today’”.

In relation to ‘attendance of CYP’, it was evident that CYP are invited to the ASR meeting by SENCo B, and the length of time spent in their review is dependent on the decision made by SENCo B. On one hand it was stated that, ‘I think [CYP] could be there for the whole review. Unless there was something very specific, and it would normally come at a parental request really rather than school’. However, SENCo B did acknowledge that being responsible for the ASR process in school is a new part of her role, and “Well up to now, I’ve only had a few emergency reviews, and the young people haven’t been there. There are reviews to be held on Friday, and the young people do want to be there. So that will be the first time that I’ll have had the pupils there”.

SENCo B acknowledged that, “Often, the opportunity is used as well to share information, which perhaps it wouldn’t be appropriate to discuss it in front of the child. So when parents come in, or if there are multi agencies, I will say, ‘is it ok if I invite them in now? Or would you like to talk first and then we’ll invite them later?’ so this is how it is done”. Hence, on occasions in recent practice CYP would attend for part of the ASR meeting.
SENCo B is responsible for submitting the ‘outcome documentation’ to the LA within two weeks following an ASR, “To make sure that any significant adjustments are written into the statement”. Information that is included in the outcome documentation includes the ‘My Review’ worksheet with the CYP’s views, the parents’ views, the individual behaviour plan (IBP), attendance record, the pupil profile demonstrating trends in learning, targets and current achievements. Parents and if there is a social worker supporting the CYP will receive a copy of the outcome documentation.

With regard to ‘follow up after the ASR meeting’, any decisions made regarding changes to current provision are reviewed and monitored by SENCo B, “Just checking things that had been put into place… monitor…” . However, feedback to the CYP after the ASR meeting is not currently part of the ASR process, “there’s no formal feedback, other than, again, it’s whether the parents… school don’t officially do a debrief or feedback…”.

4.4.2.3 Main theme: Parents

Fig. 4.15 Thematic map for main theme: Parents

SENCo B considered ‘individual needs of parents’ when planning and carrying out the ASR. In terms of personal experiences, “a lot of parents have actually had negative experiences of school, and the whole thing about coming in is stressful for them. Obviously, your focus is on the pupil, but the parents – it’s a big thing for them… it’s making them feel comfortable too”.

SENCo B shared that “It’s having that knowledge of the parents, because literacy is something that, certainly in terms of our school, I would say we have three times the risk of dyslexia in school. Because it
runs in families, it is highly likely that the parents may not be able to access written reports”. SENCo B attempts to support parents to access the ASR documentation by taking their needs into consideration, “It’s knowing the parents and how they normally respond… sometimes it’s better to telephone and make sure they’ve got that information… the more knowledge you have the better able you are to help them”.

Special consideration and understanding is given when inviting parents to attend the ASR meeting due to the nature of CYP attending special provision, “We are unusual because we are not like a local school, where the home is just around the corner. People are having to travel, and they don’t always have the means or even the money to do that”.

According to SENCo B, having parents in attendance is ‘important in the ASR process’, as demonstrated by an example whereby school were wishing to accommodate the needs of a parent who was extremely ill at the time that the ASR was particularly important. SENCo A stated, “I’m going to ask whether the monitoring officer from the town hall would be happy to go out and do a home visit, because I would be prepared to do a home visit”.

SENCo B suggested that parents could share their views, develop a mutual understanding with school regarding the CYP, and be part of the decision-making process. For example, during the ASR meeting discussion regarding future options for the CYP could be had “…to let parents know of what’s available. Perhaps the young person might have resisted, or not really taken up anything… so this can be said to parents so that they are aware and they can have the same discussions at home”. Parents were also considered able to share the views of CYP on their behalf, “So although they weren’t there, the carer was giving us their views and reporting on them. So then their views we taken into account”
4.4.2.4 Main theme: CYP involved in decision-making

Fig. 4.16 Thematic map for main theme: CYP involved in decision-making

CYP were reported by SENCo B to be involved in decision-making as the ‘views of CYP taken into consideration’. When taking into account the future of CYP, school have a careers worker who has a role in the ASR, “[Careers worker] will come in, and he works with the young people anyway. He will speak to them prior to the review and again afterwards, he will prepare them for it and bring them in. So he is also involved in that’. The researcher could see that if the careers worker discusses with the young people their options, and then these are discussed again in the ASR they are likely to feel much more part of that part of the decision-making process, rather than if it was discussed for the first time at the meeting.

When considering appropriateness of provision, SENCo B suggested that the views of CYP are included in decision-making, for example:

“Where they see themselves in 12 months time, because if they are looking at, and if they feel ready, and if things are going really well and they feel ready to look at mainstream, this is the time to look at that. If things are not going so well and they are struggling, particularly with some of the older young people, it might be a time where we look at alternative provision for them on a part time basis”.

Although adults evidently would make the final decision, their views appear to be valued and included in the process.
When it would be necessary to consider alternative or work-based placement, SENCo B gave an example of how CYP’s views can be highly involved in decision-making, for example:

“The young person didn’t attend [the ASR], and that was the problem, it was because they weren’t attending or engaging with any discussion at all when they were in school. But they were saying that they would access learning elsewhere. So work-based learning was set up for them… although they weren’t there, the carer was giving us their views and reporting on them. So then their views were taken into account”.

It is evident that the CYP expressed his views through his carer, and through his behaviour and refusal to engage or cooperate with adults, and these views were taken into account by school who had the responsibility of making the decision.

The issue that ‘adults have a duty of care for CYP’ was evident in the data. SENCo B recognised that school had a role in providing CYP with the appropriate provision if it was within their means; therefore decision-making about doing so appeared to be viewed as being their responsibility. For example:

“If there are things that need to be put into place, it’s school to let the young person and parents know that these things are going to be happening to help because we can see that this is a problem. And so this is because it is our duty to do that to put something in place, and that’s what we’ll be doing to make sure that provision is improved”.

On reflection of an example whereby a CYP was not engaging, despite the provision offered being in response to his individual request, SENCo B shared:

“… it seems to be whatever you put into place is not right. But, at least we’ve listened and we’ve offered and we’ve tried everything, and tried to accommodate as much as possible. But we are not optimistic and we are worried that it’s got to this point, and it is where to go from there. So we’ll be looking to the LA officer to ask for advice on where do we go next”.

After attempts to involve the CYP in decision-making to determine appropriate provision, school were unable to continue in this manner as they had a duty of care to meet the needs of the CYP.
It appeared that so-called ‘emergency reviews’ were organised when adults were exercising their duty of care for the CYP, as shared by SENCo B:

“... because we’re looking at and questioning whether the child’s needs are being met here and now, and what needs to be done... that might be a situation where in the past this ['My Review' worksheet] might be filled in in retrospect. It’s because it’s being called, we’ve got to have this in a few days time, but that’s something again that needs to change... [the emergency review] might be one where [CYP] might be there for part of the meeting, where there might be discussions just to fill everybody in on ‘this is what’s been happening’, and then to invite [CYP] in. It’s not necessarily about the piece of paper ['My Review' worksheet], although that can be filled in, but it’s for them to be there and to be aware. Particularly if it is that things are breaking down”.

SENCo B suggested that ‘CYP need to be empowered to make decisions’. CYP were considered on an individual basis in terms of their ability to engage with decision-making, with SENCo A acknowledging that “some children genuinely don’t want to engage because they are in their own little bubble, and perhaps things always happen to them, rather than with them... and that’s the nature of them” with them also being described as “anti-school” which has an impact on their ability to participate. Having a sense of empowerment was viewed by SENCo B as something that could help CYP to engage in decision-making and this was felt to be needed to be encouraged, “to get them to break out of that bubble, and to realise that there are other people around and involved with them and interested in them”.

4.4.2.5 Main theme: Participation in the ASR processes for CYP

Fig. 4.17 Thematic map for main theme: Participation in the ASR processes for CYP

SENCo B felt that ‘CYPs’ understanding of the ASR meeting’ was basic, as she shared:

“… they know it’s about them, I think they know that much, and that they’re going to be talked about. Thinking about younger children… I would imagine that they would be thinking that, it’d be like a parents day, have I done well in school, have I not… I think that they’d be pleasantly surprised because it would be more about what they’d done well, and looking at the positives. But acknowledging that certain situation that they find hard”.

It was hoped that improving processes to involve CYP in their ASR would improve their understanding of the ASR meeting.

SENCo B hoped for a range of ‘positive outcomes of participation in the ASR meeting’, for example, “The best outcome for them, I feel, would be… to know that school and parents were interested in them, that they were moving forwards… that they could actually see where they were going as well, in the future, either the immediate future or the long term future. And that they would feel more secure in school. That they would know that… the lines of communication were open, and that if they needed anything they could ask”.
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SENCo B gave an example of a CYP who had the opportunity to attend part of his review, and a positive outcome of his participation was described, “because of his situation on that day, it was nice for him to see that school were already working with brand new parents who he’d met over a few weeks, and all of a sudden he was going to be moving in with them that evening. But good for him to see that we all work together, and we were all about looking after him”.

SENCo B described the ‘negative impact of participation in the ASR process’ that can sometimes occur, for example, “… they get a little bit stressed because they know that people are going to be coming in and they’re going to be talking about them… because of their emotional factors that they can act up a little bit, because it’s their review that day and they are a bit nervous, and people are coming in… and what’s going to be said. And they can actually act up and get themselves into a situation where their behaviour is such that, you know, that maybe they won’t be able to come in”.

### 4.4.2.6 Main theme: Child-centred processes

Fig. 4.18 Thematic map for the main theme: Child-centred processes

SENCo B described ‘flexibility in ASR processes’ to support the participation of CYP in the ASR process and the gathering of their views, for example in relation to completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet:
“well, they’d need to be in the frame of mind really… but they’re given out a fortnight before when I speak to the class teachers and ask for the pupil information. So they have that fortnight then to complete them… So it’s not the question that, you’re only got today and you’ve got to do it now, but obviously if it comes to the review, there might be a push! Particularly if they’ve not been in school or they’ve not been attending… to do that”.

There are times when more than one meeting is required to complete to ASR process for some CYP, “normally the review is held, and there’s a deadline, and [the LA] want this paperwork within a fortnight, and I’m saying to her ‘no this isn’t completed’. Because until Mum and the child have seen the provisions and are ready to discuss it again and come back, that is going to be the completion of the process”. Again, SENCo B emphasises the importance of informed choices and shared decisions.

‘Preparation for the ASR meeting’ is considered to be important by SENCo B to put CYP at ease whether they are due to participate or not, “it would be discussed beforehand that there’s a meeting about them, looking at how you’re doing in school, whether you’re enjoying it, is there anything that we need to do that’s different… and looking at things you’re doing well. Then they wouldn’t be scared about it”.

SENCo B identified specific processes that are in place to prepare CYP for the ASR meeting, firstly the role of the careers worker in supporting CYP to become involved in the decision-making process regarding their future in advance of the ASR meeting. Secondly, the ‘My Review’ worksheet was identified as ‘useful’ in the preparation stage of the process. For example, SENCo B shared “If they are going to come in on the review, I think ‘My Review’ worksheet is good for them… It’s a useful framework for them to have to support them”.

SENCo B explained that CYP are always made aware of the ASR meeting, its purpose and when it is happening, regardless of whether they will attend or not, as she shared:

“I think the very basic thing is that it is explained to them that we’re looking at how they are enjoying school, and is this going to be the right place for them. Or are they going to be thinking about other things for the future, or are they happy to stay here… is there any way we can improve on their learning here, and anything they want to say, an opportunity really for people to say whether it’s going well, and if it’s not going well what can we do to fix it”.
There was the sense that it is ‘important for CYP to attend the ASR meeting’ if they express that they would like to, and at the least SENCo B shared that “I think it’s important that they are invited”. SENCo B felt that even attending the meeting and not necessarily being present for or participating in any discussion is important to support their understanding of the ASR process, for example:

“I will bring them just to say hi to their parent, to know that we’d met, and to know that the ASR had taken place, but also being aware that… because they know that mum and dad are coming in because we’ve had this chat, and they’ve given their own points of view beforehand, and I think it’s important that they know that this discussion has taken place even if they’ve not been part of it, for whatever reason”.

A barrier that SENCo B reported to be attempting to overcome in her new role is to organise the ASR meetings at a time where CYP could attend if they wanted to. As it was explained, “We’ve had to rearrange some meetings recently because we found that the annual reviews were coinciding with the children being out at work experience placements”. SENCo B is keen to rearrange ASRs when CYP want to attend but are unable to, for example “I think it’s important as well that if for any reason they can’t make the reviews, for instance there were a couple of pupils last week that couldn’t make it, or the parents couldn’t make it, to rearrange”. This level of organisation would appear to be reasonably challenging, taking account of CYP’s timetables, for example “It might be that it’s going to take them out of class. Sometimes they think ‘oh I’m in the middle of baking cakes, I don’t want to go’, that kind of thing”, as well as having other people who would be attending and have their own schedule including parents and professionals.

SENCo B aimed for ‘positive experiences of participation for CYP in the ASR’, therefore she would need to manage the content of discussion particularly regarding that led by parents. For example:

“parents, they might think this is an opportunity for me to get rids of my issues with what’s been happening at home, and what they’re not doing, and the last thing the child would need would be to come in and have it”. SENCo B felt that “you’d have to try and… police that carefully and make sure that you dwelled on the positives, and maybe even if you had some negative feedback on the form for the parents beforehand, to have that discussion with them beforehand… and stress and say that we’re going to bring X to talk about what they’ve achieved because they have done really well in school. And let them know that this is what we were going to talk about, and not about the home”.
SENCo B acknowledged that simple things such as offering CYP refreshments during the ASR meeting could help them to feel more comfortable. SENCo B shared that “I’m hoping that they would enjoy the fact that it was about them, and that they were being asked. I’m hoping it would be a positive thing, otherwise they wouldn’t want to go in again would they”.

‘CYPs’ perceived ability to participate’ was considered and determined by SENCo B, who felt that good candidates for participation in the ASR process would be “Those who are interested and who like to have their voice heard, and value their opinions being listened to and respected”. SENCo B suggested that CYP would respond differently to one another to a formal meeting such as this, and this response is best to be considered beforehand whilst planning the level of participation for each CYP. The age of individual CYP was identified as an influential factor in the past when planning the level of participation for CYP, “I do know that, certainly in terms of the primary children, that they haven’t always been included in the attendance at the reviews”.

SENCo B made reference to taking each individual CYP’s emotional wellbeing and current state into consideration when planning their participation in the ASR meeting. For example, “the young lady that was being discussed, again… mental health issues, in a really bad place… and I did go to find her, but because she was literally climbing the walls… she just wasn’t ready and able to access the meeting. And all we had were her points of view on this form. And it was a discussion around her issues and things that were happening. And when I came back I had to apologise and say she is just not able to come at this time. And it was just unfortunate, I really would have liked to have been there”. It was clearly important to SENCo B at this time to put the needs of the CYP’s before her own wishes for her to be able to take part in the ASR meeting.

SENCo B suggested that ‘CYP are supported to share their views’ in the ASR process, as adults will share on their behalf or support them by scribing their views for them if necessary. SENCo B shared two forms of the ‘My Review’ worksheet, one that is aimed towards younger CYP and one for older CYP. However, SENCo B is happy for CYP to choose the sheet they would like to complete, “[The ‘My Review’ worksheets] are just different, and sometimes it could be a matter of which they would like to choose”, often a deciding factor will be the demand on literacy. Both ‘My Review’ worksheets include alternative suggestions for CYP to share their views with the LA, however “No, we’ve not don’t that before… because as I say I’ve not been… but if somebody wanted to then I would. It’s their choice, and I’d be quite happy to do that”. 
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SENCo B reports that the ‘My Review’ worksheet is a ‘useful’ tool for supporting CYP in sharing their views, “they are a focus, and a framework so they give a structure. And they are useful as a visual aid so to speak, you know to say these are the kind of things that we are thinking about, so that they get the picture”. However, SENCo B feels that “they are not the be all and end all. Because if the children were there, it would be recorded anyway, it would be written in and reported back to people in the [outcome documentation]”. Although SENCo B agrees that the ‘My Review’ worksheet serves a purpose of preparation, she feels that “It’s not adequate on it’s own” as a form of participation in the ASR process.

SENCo B reflecting on the ASR process and having responsibility for the ASRs as a new part of her role, shared her views on ‘developing ASR processes to involve CYP’. SENCo A stated, facilitating the participation of CYP “Is something that I have felt strongly about for a long time, because I do feel that we are going to be developing in terms of including the young people in the process”.

4.4.3 Case C: Preparation for the ASR meeting

4.4.3.1 Overview of data

Content analysis of the data collected during observation of the preparatory meeting with Child C was carried out, with the number of codes identified in each of the pre-determined categories from the synthesised model of participation (see fig. 2.1) included in table 4.3. Content analysis was carried out on the ‘My Review’ worksheet to provide contextual data to inform the research questions, therefore individual comments made by Child C were not analysed.
Table 4.3 Findings from content analysis carried out on documentation gathered for Child C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Child C – Special Provision Number of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘My Review’ worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Shared with adults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.2 ‘My Review’ worksheet in special provision

The ‘My Review’ worksheet was completed by Child C in the special provision, and analysed on the basis of the contextual information it provided rather than the individual responses given. The ‘My Review’ worksheet used in the special provision for Child C was very similar to that completed in the resource based provision. The LA produced both ‘My
Review’ worksheets, the only real difference being that the one used for Child C was aimed towards older children. Hence the overall findings from analysis of this document were largely similar to those for Cases A and B.

The ‘My Review’ worksheet was found to primarily result in participation of CYP that was initiated and assigned by adults. Once more, the researcher found the ‘My Review’ worksheet to facilitate the participation of CYP due to the age appropriate layout, including the colours, illustrations and font used. The ‘My Review’ worksheet again allowed CYP to share their views and be listened to, and have their views taken into account by those with access to this document. Once more when considering decision-making around their needs, it was found that CYP were given the opportunity to be involved in decision-making led by adults through use of the worksheet, for example due to the inclusion of questions regarding reviewing progress, achievements and difficulties, as well as planning for the future. However, as before the researcher emphasises that although these opportunities are given, alone they are not enough for the child to be involved in the decision-making process.

4.4.3.3 Observation of preparatory meeting

Child C’s participation in the preparatory meeting was viewed primarily as adult initiated and assigned, including when SENCo B gave Child C the opportunity to add more to his views at a later date if he felt that he wanted to. As written in the observation record, ‘SENCo encouraged Child C that if he wants to add anything later, or thinks of anything later he can, or say it at the review, or to SENCo beforehand’. Child C initiated discussion regarding his views on the careers worker, which led to discussion between SENCo B and the child. Child C did participate in the preparatory meeting through consultation with SENCo B, for example ‘SENCo B prompted Child C with information she knows about them, e.g. doing coursework, to give him some ideas’. There was evidence to suggest that Child B’s participation in the task was facilitated, for example ‘SENCo went through each Q’, which will have supported Child C who has some difficulty with reading.

Child C was clearly supported to express his views, and these views were felt to be listened to, for example, ‘SENCo B accepted Child C’s views on the careers worker, did not dismiss them. She listened and allowed him to speak’. There was some evidence of Child C’s views being taken
into account, for example ‘SENCo B offered understanding of why Child C might feel this way, as personal questions can be uncomfortable’. However, there did not appear to be as much opportunity for Child C’s views to be taken into account, as this would link in with decision-making and the researcher did not find any evidence of CYP being given the opportunity to participate in decision-making around their needs during this preparatory meeting. The aim of this meeting was to gather the CYP’s views and prepare them to attend the ASR meeting should they wish. Decision-making around the child’s needs was not due to take place as part of this preparatory meeting.

4.4.4 Case C: The ASR meeting

It was not possible for the researcher to attend the ASR meeting held for Child C however; the researcher gathered brief feedback from SENCo B regarding the ASR meeting held for Child C at school. Child C had expressed that he did not wish to attend the ASR meeting, therefore it was attended by his mother, neighbour, careers worker and SENCo B. It was reported that Child C’s views and hopes for his future career were included in the discussion regarding options for the future after school. The main areas of conversation during the ASR meeting were his progress and how he was getting on, and his options for the future, which would then be discussed with Child C after the ASR meeting so that he could make a decision on the one that he would like to aim for. SENCo B reported that Child C had proactively gone to request feedback from the meeting from her and was aware that he had done the same with his mother.

4.4.5 Case C: Child C’s views on the ASR process

4.4.5.1 Thematic map of data from interview with Child C

See fig. 4.19 for a diagram representing the final thematic map for Child C. The map is then presented in parts focusing on individual themes throughout section 4.4.4 (see fig. 4.20-4.22).
Fig. 4.19 Final thematic map representing main and subthemes from interview data regarding Child C’s views on his experience of the ASR process
**4.4.5.2 Main theme: Positive view of ‘My Review’**

Fig. 4.20 Thematic map for the main theme: Positive view of ‘My Review’

Child C engaged with completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet as an ‘adult initiated task’, saying ‘I’ve just go to do it, so I just got it done’. Child C described the ‘My Review’ worksheet to be ‘accessible’, as he was able to engage with the worksheet primarily by giving one word or short written answers to each question on the sheet. The researcher asked Child C whether he could identify any questions that were hard than others to answer, to which he responded “They’re all alright”.

Child C appeared to be happy to engage with the ‘My Review’ worksheet as an ‘opportunity to share his views’ and be a part of the ASR process on reflection of the fact that he would be not attending the ASR meeting. As Child C shared, “It’s just fine, because I don’t go in it so…” The format of the ‘My Review’ worksheet was identified as a ‘facilitator’ for participation. Child C felt that it was “easy” to complete the ‘My Review’ worksheet, because “I know what I need help with and what I’ve achieved and that”. The researcher felt that this will have facilitated Child C’s ability to participate in this part of the ASR process.

Child C shared that he finds reading and writing difficult whilst feeding back on the comments he made during completion of the ‘My Review’ worksheet, hence this was identified as a potential ‘barrier’. He shared that, “When I filled in the first one I had to get help, because I couldn’t read the bit that you couldn’t read. Because I couldn’t hardly see it”. Child C reported that this was due to poor photocopying, but this emphasised to the researcher that having difficulty with literacy could act as a barrier to some CYP whilst completing the
‘My Review’ worksheet. CYP of secondary school age such as Child C may find it difficult to admit such difficulties, contributing to the barrier made by literacy difficulties in participating in this part of the ASR process.

4.4.5.3 Main theme: Negative view of attending the ASR meeting

Fig. 4.21 Thematic map for the main theme: Negative view of attending the ASR meeting

Child C demonstrated that he had a basic ‘understanding of the purpose of the ASR meeting’, therefore making a relatively informed decision about whether he would like to attend or not. As Child C stated, “How my behaviour is in school and that… How my work is doing and stuff like that”.

Child C referred to ‘making a choice to not attend the ASR meeting’, although he had been given the opportunity to attend, as he said “I don’t like them really” and with a view to considering whether he would go in the future, “I just don’t want to go”. Child C appeared to hold a ‘negative view based on previous experience’. Child C reported that he had attended his ASR meeting when he was in Year 6 at the school that he presently attended, and based on his experience of that meeting he had never agreed to attend another one of his ASR meetings that had taken place since. “Yeah, I’ve been to one. And then I didn’t like the rest when I was in Years 7, 8 and 9 I didn’t like them”.
Child C developed a negative view of participating in the ASR meeting based on his experience of attending the meeting when he was younger, and specific factors were highlighted as ‘barriers to participation’ when he more recently would consider the opportunity to attend the ASR meeting. Firstly, Child C reported that, “They go on for too long for me… they go on forever”. Secondly, Child C reported that he did not enjoy the experience of being asked a lot of questions by the adults, to which he did not know how to respond. For example, “It’s just they talk, and then they start asking me questions. And I don’t really know what to say, I don’t really know the answers or anything… they just ask you all these questions, like ‘can you change your behaviour?’ and ‘what do you want to do when you leave school?’ and that”. It appears that this certainly put Child C off attending the ASR meeting again.

Due to the barriers identified to Child C participating in his ASR meeting again following on from his negative experience when he was younger, the researcher identified ‘importance of effective preparation’ of CYP for their ASR meeting to be of great value. As described by Child C, “Yeah, they’re hard like… they ask you all questions, like ‘can you change?’ and that… they ask you all mad questions, and you can’t really answer them”. The researcher would argue whether effective preparation for such questioning would have made this a more positive experience for Child C.

4.4.5.4 Main theme: Participation in the ASR process

Fig. 4.22 Thematic map for the main theme: Participation in the ASR process
‘Completion of ‘My Review’ worksheet’ helped Child C feel that he was still participating in the ASR process by sharing his views using this method. Adults could then share Child C’s views as part of the ASR meeting which when the researcher asked Child C if he felt ok about this, he said “Yeah, I think they do [read out the ‘My Review’ worksheet]”. The researcher reflected back to Child C, “so it’s finding the best way for you to be involved and to have your say, that you feel comfortable with. Because there’d be no use in Miss saying, you’ve got to go to your review and you’ve got to sit there, if you don’t want to be there. You feel happier sharing your views in another way”, to which he agreed.

‘Preparation with careers worker’ that took place with Child C included discussion regarding future options after school. Although positive outcomes of this work were evident, for example Child C said “Yeah… but I know the answer for when I leave school… I want to be a chef” and later excitedly shared that following the ASR meeting he found out that “[careers worker] could get me an apprenticeship or something. And he was saying I could be on £93 a week”. However, generally Child C didn’t appear to enjoy the one to one sessions he had with the careers worker, as he said “He asks you all questions that you don’t feel comfortable answering him… Yeah, like where do I go and who do I hang around with and that”. This negative view may have impacted on the effectiveness of the preparation for Child C contributing to this decision-making process as part of the ASR.

Child C demonstrated he ‘valued adult feedback after the ASR meeting’, as he explained, “But when my review was over, I asked SENCo B how did it go, and SENCo B spoke to me… And she was saying it went well and that”. This shows that Child B was proactive in order to seek out feedback from his ASR meeting, and suggests that he was keen to be involved in the ASR process in this way. Child C acknowledged that, “I just don’t really like [ASR meeting]… Because I’d rather wait to get home and see what my mum says”. Hence, it would appear that Child C would prefer to gather feedback from the adults involved after the ASR meeting that participate in the meeting itself. This does not give him the opportunity to influence discussion at the time of the ASR meeting, however he is keen to contribute his views and gather information regarding the outcome of the ASR meeting. Therefore despite his choice to not attend the ASR meeting, Child C appears to be taking a reasonably active role in the ASR process.

Child C made reference to his ‘views taken into consideration by adults’. Child C believed that school wished to know his response to the questions asked on the ‘My Review’
worksheet “So they could help me and that”. When the researcher reflected back to Child C, “it’s still important for you to share your views but you don’t want to be at the meeting” he agreed. Child C clearly felt that it was important for his views to at least be included in the ASR process, as he said, “It probably wouldn’t be right without mine… because then it would just be for them and not for me”.

4.4.6 Case C: Outcome documentation of the ASR

SENCo B did not submit the outcome documentation for analysis in the research.

4.4.7 Case C: Summary of findings

4.4.7.1 Summary of contextual findings for case C

SENCo B provided contextual data in relation to ASR processes for CYP with SEBD in the special provision. According to the contextual data, much of the practical aspects of the ASR process are adult-led in the special provision, including the organisation of information gathering, whether CYP attend and how long for, and producing the outcome documentation for the LA. Parents were identified to be significant in the ASR processes carried out at the special provision, and particular reference was made to the individual needs of parents and how it is important to account for these when planning the ASR, in order to enable parents to participate in the process.

There was evidence in the data to suggest that CYP attending the special provision are involved in decision-making around their needs as part of the ASR. SENCo B hoped for CYP to have a positive experience when participating in their ASR meeting, and to feel supported by adults in attendance. SENCo B acknowledged that some CYP who attend the special provision can be unsettled by the knowledge of their ASR meeting. Therefore participation even at the minimum level of knowing when the ASR meeting would be held can have a negative impact on some CYP. There was a range of evidence to suggest that much of the ASR processes at the special provision were carried out in a child-centred manner. SENCo B was keen to improve current ASR processes to include CYP in the
ASR process more than they had been previously, and had a positive view of participation for CYP in the ASR process.

The ‘My Review’ worksheet was an adult initiated task in the special provision, assigned to CYP to complete. CYP were given the opportunity to share their views on relevant aspects of the ASR process that could contribute to decision-making, however this would be dependent on how this information would be used be adults. The layout and presentation of the worksheet was age appropriate and appealing, therefore viewed to facilitate participation of CYP in this task.

4.4.7.2 Summary of findings for Child C

Child C’s participation in the preparatory meeting was observed to be primarily initiated by and consulted with SENCo B. On one occasion Child C initiated his own participation in the preparatory meeting by starting a discussion regarding his views of the preparatory work carried out by the careers worker. Overall in the preparatory meeting Child C’s views were listened to and he was supported to express these views. There was little opportunity for his views to be taken into account, as decision-making around Child C’s needs was not part of the preparatory meeting, however it appeared that where possible SENCo B did take Child C’s views into consideration.

Child C chose not to attend his ASR meeting. On reflection of the ASR process, Child C had a positive view of the ‘My Review’ worksheet that he completed to share his views. Particularly as he was not keen to attend his ASR meeting, this worksheet was viewed as giving Child C the opportunity to share his views, which he did value despite not wanting to attend the ASR meeting. Child C felt that adults would take his views into account during the ASR meeting. Child C had made his decision not to attend the ASR meeting based on previous experience, however valued his opportunity to participate prior to the ASR meeting and to gather feedback from adults after the ASR meeting had taken place. It was important for Child C to be able to participate in the way that he chose to, and he did view it as this, rather than not wanting to participate at all.
4.5 Cross-Case Analysis

4.5.1 Overview of findings from cross-case analysis of subthemes

The researcher carried out a cross-case analysis of the resulting subthemes in cases A-C, identifying all subthemes for each case related to individual propositions for each of the three research questions. A representation of these findings can be found in table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Findings from cross-case analysis in respect of each proposition made for each research question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question (proposition)</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1 (a)</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>• Information sharing</td>
<td>• Information gathering in preparation for the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Information gathering in preparation for the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing participation of CYP</td>
<td>• Developing participation of CYP</td>
<td>• Outcome documentation</td>
<td>• Outcome documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CYP supported to share their views</td>
<td>• CYP supported to share their views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing ASR processes to involve CYP</td>
<td>• Developing ASR processes to involve CYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation for the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Preparation for the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus of the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Focus of the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1 (b)</td>
<td>LA and government</td>
<td>• LA and government</td>
<td>• Important for CYP to attend the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Important for CYP to attend the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>• Information sharing</td>
<td>• Attendance of CYP</td>
<td>• Attendance of CYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical aspects of the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Practical aspects of the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Flexibility in the ASR process</td>
<td>• Flexibility in the ASR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitating the voice of the child</td>
<td>• Facilitating the voice of the child</td>
<td>• CYPs’ perceived ability to participate</td>
<td>• CYPs’ perceived ability to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review, planning and decision-making</td>
<td>• Review, planning and decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting</td>
<td>• Considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1 (c)</td>
<td>Considerations for planning</td>
<td>• Considerations for planning</td>
<td>• Positive experience of participation for</td>
<td>• Positive experience of participation for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RQ2 (a) | Considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting  
- Making choices  
- Things that help you to have your say | Considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting  
- Making choices  
- Things that help you to have your say | CYPs’ understanding of the ASR meeting  
- CYP need to be empowered to make decisions |
|---|---|---|---|
| RQ2 (b) | Facilitating the voice of the child  
- Familiar adults in the ASR meeting  
- Evaluation of current practice  
- Understanding the purpose of the ASR  
- Things that help you to have your say | Facilitating the voice of the child  
- Familiar adults in the ASR meeting  
- Facilitators for participation  
- Value opportunity to listen to adults  
- Outcome of the ASR meeting | CYP supported to share their views  
- Preparation for the ASR meeting  
- Completion of ‘My Review’ worksheet  
- Making a choice not to attend the ASR meeting  
- Understanding of the purpose of the ASR meeting  
- Negative view based on previous experience  
- Importance of effective preparation  
- Facilitator (Positive view of ‘My Review’)  
- Accessible (Positive view of ‘My Review’)  
- Potential barrier  
- Adult-initiated task (Positive view of ‘My Review’)  
- Preparation with careers worker |
| RQ3 (a) | Information sharing  
- Making choices | Information sharing  
- Valued (opportunity to share views)  
- Allow adults to take the lead in the ASR meeting | Outcome documentation  
- Opportunity to share views |
| RQ3 (b) | Role of LA in decision-making  
- Influences on | Role of LA in decision-making  
- Influences on | Views of CYP taken into consideration |
**4.5.2 Cross-case comparisons for research question 1**

In *special and resource based provision*, how are *ASR processes* designed to include the participation of *CYP with SEBD* in planning, review and decision-making around their needs?

**4.5.2.1 Research question 1: Proposition (a)**

*ASR processes are designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.*

The ‘My Review’ worksheet was described as a mechanism in place in both special and resource based provision to ensure that CYPs’ views were gathered in the aspects of review, planning and decision-making around their needs at the time of the ASR meeting. The LA designed both worksheets with the purpose of gathering the views of CYP in the ASR process. Table 4.5 demonstrates clearly that the ‘My Review’ worksheets used in each
provision were extremely similar to one another, as one might expect due to the key
difference being the audience for which the worksheet was aimed.

Table 4.5 Comparing findings from content analysis of the ‘My Review’ worksheet
completed in the resource based and special provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>‘My Review’ worksheet Number of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource based provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Shared with adults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENCo A and SENCo B referred to ensuring CYPs’ comments were collected in writing
through use of the ‘My Review’ worksheet prior to the ASR meeting and included as part
of the outcome documentation, as described in subthemes ‘information sharing’,
‘information gathering in preparation for the ASR meeting’ and ‘outcome documentation’.
SENCo B reported that ‘CYP were supported to share their views’ in the ASR process, and their views could be shared on their behalf if they did not wish to attend the ASR meeting.

In terms of ‘preparation for the ASR meeting’, SENCo B discussed how CYP were given the opportunity to be made aware of the ASR meeting and its’ purpose, they would be invited to attend, and they would be asked to share their views in the areas of review, planning and decision-making by completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet. No such practice was evident in the subthemes identified for SENCo A in the resource based provision. However, Child A and B in the resource based provision both made reference to being given pre-warning of the ASR meeting.

In addition to processes being designed to include the views of CYP on review, planning and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process, SENCo B expressed that although the ‘focus of the ASR meeting’ could depend on the age of CYP in terms of the type of decisions being made, the overall focus of the ASR meeting was viewed to be an opportunity to share information with CYP, so that they could make informed choices.

SENCo A began to consider adapting the ASR process in terms of ‘developing participation of CYP’ in planning, review and decision-making around their needs, by including the process of reviewing their IEP targets. This was a view shared by SENCo B, as described in the subtheme ‘developing ASR processes to involve CYP’ she was passionate about her new role in taking the lead with ASRs at the special provision to ensure that the participation of CYP was something that would become embedded in the process.

4.5.2.2 Research question 1: Proposition (b)

The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is determined by adults.

It was reported by SENCo A in the resource based provision that the ‘LA and government’ had significant influence over the ASR process in school, as they were viewed as the force behind increasing the involvement of CYP in the process by providing schools with the ‘My Review’ worksheet and ensuring this was submitted as part of the outcome
documentation. This finding supports the proposition that how much CYP are able to participate in the ASR process is determined by adults, demonstrating that adults directly influence their opportunities to participate, in this case for the better.

Information gathering prior to the ASR meeting, and ‘information sharing’ during the ASR meeting of views provided by all of those involved, including CYP, was reported to be organised by SENCo A. Hence, this finding suggests that the level of participation of CYP in the planning, review and decision-making aspects of the ASR meeting is determined by adults, specifically in this case by SENCo A.

In the resource based provision ‘practical aspects of the ASR meeting’ were considered when reflecting on the participation of CYP, such as the length of time spent by CYP in the ASR meeting, which was viewed to influence their participation and experience of being involved. SENCo A reported that it was more beneficial for CYP to attend a small part of the ASR meeting as they would become bored, and more beneficial for adults as negative discussion could be had more freely without the presence of the CYP. Hence, as SENCo A held this view and was key to the ASR process in the resource based provision, this determined the level of participation that she would offer to each CYP.

SENCo B expressed a view that it was ‘important for CYP to attend the ASR meeting’, and then in terms of the level of their participation in the ASR meeting she would hope for CYP to at least be present for a short time to develop a basic awareness of the process. Overall, this demonstrates that the level of participation of CYP was determined by SENCo B, however it seemed that wherever possible she would follow the CYP’s lead, with an overall aim of them participating as much as they would like to if it was considered to be in their best interests at the time.

Evidently, the ‘attendance of CYP’ at their ASR meeting in the special provision was determined by SENCo B, who invited CYP to attend and determined the length of time spent in the meeting as well as the discussion planned to be had whilst they were present. Differently to SENCo A, SENCo B felt that CYP would be welcome to stay for the entire ASR meeting if they chose, as any necessary discussion for the ASR meeting would be suitable to be had whilst the CYP was present. Anything unsuitable to be discussed in front of the CYP was reported as likely to be not relevant to the ASR meeting, and could be discussed another time. This is a clear difference in findings between the resource based
and special provisions. SENCo B was open to the concept of ‘flexibility in the ASR process’ to allow for CYP to participate if they expressed a desire to do so. No such flexibility was evident in the findings from SENCo A in the resource based provision.

In the subtheme ‘facilitating the voice of the child’, SENCo A expressed the view that CYP were capable of participating in the ASR process to the extent of sharing their views on review, planning and decision-making as part of the ‘My Review’ worksheet, however she was not sure that CYP could contribute to the process beyond this task. SENCo A reported that on reflection of ASR processes in the resource based provision, CYP were not generally given the opportunity to participate in the ‘review, planning and decision-making’ aspects of the ASR, other than by sharing their views usually in the form of the ‘My Review’ worksheet. Adults were viewed to be the most influential in all three aspects of the ASR process in the resource based provision, hence this view was felt to have some impact on the fact that CYP were generally being excluded from being involved in the review, planning and decision-making aspects of the ASR. Again, this finding was supportive of the proposition that adults would determine CYPs’ participation in the ASR.

SENCo A referred to a number of specific ‘considerations for planning participation CYP in the ASR meeting’, including knowledge of their parent and family circumstances and how this might impact on their ability to participate as well as their experience of participation. Other considerations were their age and individual differences, and these considerations were reportedly made with an overall aim of ensuring CYP would have a positive experience of participation. This finding provides evidence for the proposition that adults would determine the level of participation of CYP in the review, planning and decision-making aspects of the ASR.

When considering ‘CYPs’ perceived ability to participate’, SENCo B described a particular type of CYP who would be keen to have their voice heard, as someone who she felt would be keen to participate in the ASR meeting in particular. SENCo B also described considerations she would make when determining the level of participation that would be offered to CYP in the special provision, which included the way that she predicted individual CYP would respond to a formal meeting. Similarly to in the resource based provision, SENCo B reported that she would also consider the age of the CYP and their current emotional state when determining their level of participation in the ASR process.
Both SENCo A and SENCo B were keen to consider the needs of the CYP and their ability to cope with participating in the relatively fixed ASR process.

4.5.2.3 Research question 1: Proposition (c)

Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.

SENCo A made ‘considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting’ to CYPs’ age, parents, family circumstances and individual differences, to ensure that their experience of participation was positive and to protect them from negative discussion or experience. SENCo A certainly reported a sense of being uncomfortable about having negative discussion regarding a CYP whilst they were present, but suggested that this may ease when considering the participation of CYP who were of secondary school age.

SENCo B also acknowledged that part of her role in enabling the participation of CYP in the ASR meeting would be to manage the content of discussion so that CYP had a ‘positive experience of participation’, particularly in respect of parents wishing to lead any negative discussion which was reflected in findings from SENCo A in the resource based provision.

SENCo B explained that she wished to avoid the potential ‘negative impact of participation in the ASR process’ when planning participation for CYP. This was viewed to be when knowledge of the ASR process and their potential participation could result in behaviour of CYP deteriorating and anxiety and emotional responses increasing, therefore having an overall negative impact on the CYP. SENCo B evidently wanted to minimise this potential negative response as much as possible. SENCo A did not refer to such a negative response in the resource based provision, however did insist on CYP having a positive experience and being seen in a positive light, as described in the subtheme ‘opportunity for CYP to show positive attributes and skills’.
4.5.3 Cross-case comparisons for research question 2

What do adults and CYP with SEBD in special and resource based provision view as effective in facilitating the participation of CYP with SEBD in the preparation for, collaboration with, and plan and/or outcomes from the ASR process?

4.5.3.1 Research question 2: Proposition (a)

Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, some of which could be described as ‘facilitators’ for participation.

When making ‘considerations for planning participation of CYP in the ASR meeting’ it was proposed that personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD would impact on their ability to participate throughout the process, and some of these could be described as facilitators for their participation. SENCo A felt that CYP were better able to participate the older they were, suggesting that the participation of CYP in the ASR process when they were very young would be less likely to be effective. Other personal attributes and circumstances of CYP in the resource based provision identified by SENCo A were their willingness to share their views, their general level of understanding, their personality, nature and confidence, in addition to their emotional state at the time of the ASR. SENCo A would consider all of these things, which would formulate her view of the individual CYP’s ability to participate in their ASR meeting. SENCo B similarly suggested that ‘CYPs’ understanding of the ASR meeting’ could influence their willingness and ability to participate in the ASR process.

It was evident that Child A had the ability to ‘make choices’ and had a sense of self whereby he knew what he wanted to do, and in addition had the communication skills to make his choices known during the ASR meeting. In terms of ‘things that help you to have your say’, Child A identified that his confidence helped him to make choices in the ASR meeting and he felt comfortable doing so. When reflecting on these findings it was evident to the researcher that this enabled Child A to participate further in the ASR process by sharing his opinion on where he would like to attend high school and how he would like to be further integrated into mainstream.
Evidence of increased participation of Child A was found when comparing the content analyses of the ASR meeting (see table 4.6), where it is demonstrated that Child A was found by the researcher to participate on his own initiative on five individual occasions, whereby Child B did not participate on his own initiative once. As a result of this, there was much more evidence of Child A’s views being listened to and taken into account during the ASR meeting, presumably as Child B did not share additional views independent from those that were asked for by SENCo A. Child C chose not to participate in his ASR meeting therefore no comparison between the provisions could be made, only comparisons within the resource based provision.

Table 4.6 Comparing findings from content analysis of the preparatory meeting for Child A and B in the resource based provision and Child C in the special provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Preparation meeting Number of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparatively, SENCo B referred to the way CYP in the special provision could commonly feel towards decision-making, which included being ‘anti-school’ and feeling that things ‘happen to them’. This was felt to contribute to disengagement, therefore SENCo B felt that ‘CYP need to be empowered to make decisions’, which in turn would facilitate their participation in the ASR process. Hence, at the time of the research this sense of empowerment in the main was not evidently established, but part of the plans for development.

4.5.3.2 Research question 2: Proposition (b)

CYP may offer invaluable insight into what helps them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it.

In an ‘evaluation of current practice’, Child A evidently found current methods of enabling the participation of CYP in the ASR process acceptable, including the ‘My Review’ worksheet and attending the ASR process for a short time. This finding was similarly reflected in the subtheme ‘facilitators for participation’ in the data given by Child B. Hence, it could be argued that both Child A and B felt that his desire to share his views had been met by the processes currently in place. Child B found using the ‘My Review’ worksheet as a script for sharing his views in the ASR meeting to be an acceptable method of sharing, identified as a ‘facilitators for participation’. In support of the views shared by Child B, the ‘My Review’ worksheet was viewed by SENCo A to facilitate the participation of CYP in the ASR meeting by providing them with a ‘script’ for sharing their views in the relevant areas, which was a view also shared by SENCo B as described in the subtheme ‘CYP supported to share their views’. Comparably, Child C suggested that the ‘completion of ‘My Review’ worksheet’ enabled him to participate in the ASR process as much as he would like to, and meet his need and desire to share his views as part of the ASR. Child C referred to ‘making a choice not to attend the ASR meeting’, as he had done so for some time, and intended on continuing to do so.
It was evident that Child A had a basic ‘understanding of the purpose of the ASR’, as did Child C. This would arguably suggest that both CYP made an informed choice regarding their attendance at the ASR meeting and their participation in the ASR process. Child C’s ‘negative view was based on previous experience’ of attending the ASR, which presented as ‘barriers to participation’ in the ASR meeting. The researcher highlighted in the data provided by Child C the ‘importance of effective participation’, suggesting that if Child C had been sufficiently prepared for the questioning he was faced with in his previous experience of the ASR meeting his overall experience may have been more positive.

Child B reported that the visually appealing aspects of the ‘My Review’ worksheet were ‘facilitators for participation’ in the ASR process. Additionally, Child C shared that a ‘facilitator’ to his participation in the ASR process was that the ‘My Review’ worksheet was easy to complete, due to his own perception and knowledge of his strengths and difficulties, therefore finding the worksheet ‘accessible’ despite the ‘potential barrier’ of his literacy difficulties. Child C viewed the task of completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet as one that was ‘adult-initiated’, and engaged on the basis of being asked to do so. SENCo A suggested such practice in the resource based provision, as described in subtheme ‘facilitating the voice of the child’.

Additionally in terms of the usefulness of the information provided by the ‘My Review’ worksheet, SENCo A expressed a desire to have the resources and capacity to find out more about the CYPs’ feelings as part of the ASR process, which she felt was a shortcoming of the ‘My Review’ worksheet. However, SENCo A felt that having a familiar adult to support the CYP whilst formulating their responses to each of the questions in the ‘My Review’ worksheet provided a mechanism for ‘facilitating the voice of the child’. This was evident in the content analysis of the preparatory meeting (see table 4.6), whereby Child B, who it was noted was extremely quiet throughout the preparatory and ASR meetings, was supported to share his views and his participation in the task was facilitated by adult support considerably more than Child A and C. However, such support for sharing views and participating in the task was still evident for each CYP due to adult support available in both meetings (see table 4.6 and 4.7).
Table 4.7 Comparing findings from content analysis of the ASR meeting for Child A and B in the resource based provision and Child C in the special provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>ASR meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Listened to</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Supported to express views</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child – Views taken into account</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Informed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Involved</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – Shared with adults</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP initiated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences in decision-making</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reflecting on ‘things that help you to have your say’, Child A felt that having familiar adults in the ASR meeting helped him to feel more confident whilst sharing his views. SENCo A also identified that having ‘familiar adults in the ASR meeting’ facilitated the participation of CYP. This was due to adults being able to make the CYP feel more comfortable, by including current and relevant positive comments about them, as well as
being able to encourage the CYP to participate throughout. Furthermore, when considering ‘things that help you to have your say’, Child A appeared to feel reasonably strongly that everybody should be given the opportunity to have their say, which the researcher felt may have underpinned why Child A made the effort to share his views whilst attending the ASR meeting.

In terms of the ‘preparation with careers worker’ in the special provision as referred to by Child C, it was evident that although he felt positively about being able to make a decision about his future that was achievable and relevant to him, he did not enjoy the one to one sessions. SENCo B explained the role of the careers worker and the preparation for the ASR that would take place in the sessions in the subtheme ‘preparation for the ASR meeting’, which appeared to be reasonable and potentially positive for CYP in terms of their ability to engage with decision-making and planning towards their future. However, the researcher suggests that perhaps if Child C was fully informed regarding why the sessions took place and the purpose of the careers worker’s questioning, he may have found the sessions more positive.

Child B suggested that he ‘valued the opportunity to listen to adults’, as he stated a preference for listening to what they had to say rather than sharing his own views or having his own views heard and taken into consideration. The ‘outcome of the ASR meeting’ according to Child B was that he was keen to improve his behaviour, as discussed when completing his ‘My Review’ worksheet and during the ASR meeting.

4.5.4 Cross-case comparisons for research question 3

In special and resource based provision, to what extent is the participation of CYP with SEBDs’ in the ASR process instrumental in the plan and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process?

4.5.4.1 Research question 3: Proposition (a)

The participation of CYP with SEBD will consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs.
In the special provision CYPs’ views on review, planning and decision-making were including in the ‘My Review’ worksheet and submitted as part of the ‘outcome documentation’ as described by SENCo B. This was also the case for the resource based provision, as SENCo A depicted for the subtheme ‘information sharing’.

Child A demonstrated his ability to ‘make choices’ by sharing his views in relation to the specified areas of review, planning and decision-making as part of the ‘My Review’ worksheet in addition to his own individual views on future provision and increased integration to mainstream provision (also evident in table 4.7). This level of participation in the ASR process was evidently initiated by Child A, and was not found in analysis of Child B or C, however Child C did not attend his ASR meeting which effectively reduced his opportunity to participate in the process.

It was evident that Child B ‘valued’ the ‘opportunity to share views’, as he was happy to share his choice of high school, and evidently had a sense of importance in his own views as he felt they would be useful for his future provision to be aware of. Child B wished to continue to attend his ASR meeting in the future. On the other hand, whilst Child C chose not to attend the ASR meeting, he continued to ensure that he used the ‘opportunity to share views’ by completing the ‘My Review’ worksheet in the knowledge of this being his chance to participate in the process.

Child B appeared to ‘allow adults to take the lead in the ASR meeting’, as demonstrated through the way that he did as he was asked by SENCo A which was to complete the ‘My Review’ worksheet, and then use this whilst attending the ASR meeting for a short time to share his views. Child B reported that he did not seek out any further information or feedback regarding the ASR meeting and its outcomes.

4.5.4.2 Research question 3: Proposition (b)

Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when they make any decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR.

An ‘outcome of having your say’ reported by Child A was that he felt his views were listened to and would be taken into account by adults as he felt that in some way they
would make a difference after the ASR meeting. Child A’s feeling of being listened to and heard was reflected in the content analysis represented in table 4.7, where it appears that Child A was much more involved in decision-making with adults and less informed by adults in decision-making that Child B. There was considerably more evidence of Child A’s views being listened to and taken into account in the ASR meeting than Child B, however it is noted that Child B shared only what he was asked to and did not initiate any further participation in the process. Another ‘outcome of having your say’ identified by Child A was feeling proud of himself, and feeling happy that he had shared his views and these had been taken into account by adults.

Child B felt that adults would be ‘taking views of the child into consideration’ when making the decision about where he would attend high school. In consideration of the subtheme ‘role of LA in decision-making’, SENCo A identified that the LA were responsible for ensuring that the views of CYP were collected using the ‘My Review’ worksheet and submitted as part of the outcome documentation. However, it was evident according to SENCo A that although CYPs’ views would be listened to they would not necessarily be taken into consideration when making what would be viewed to be such an important decision whereby the LA and parents would have the overall say. In consideration of the ‘Role of LA in decision-making’, it was clear that the LA were viewed by SENCo A to have the overall say in decisions made in the ASR process, specifically if this decision was regarding future provision for high school.

SENCo A in the resource based provision identified a number of ‘influences on decision-making’, which included the perceived size of the decision in terms of its potential impact on the CYP, which often determined who would be most influential in the final decision-making. In addition the nature of difficulties associated with the label of SEBD and the related complexity was identified to influence decision-making. Another influential factor when decisions were reported to be made in the resource based provision was identified as the availability of appropriate provision and resources for CYP. Overall, CYP were not referred to as having any direct influence in the decision-making process through participation, however it was clear that SENCo A had a positive outlook for CYP in the resource based provision and aimed to make what she perceived to be the best decisions possible for them. The presence of the CYP at their ASR meeting was viewed to be influential in decision-making and support the process for adults so that they could have
the CYP in mind, particularly for those who had never met the CYP but were making decisions about them.

Contrastingly to in the resource based provision, SENCo B suggested that the ‘views of CYP were taken into consideration’ in the special provision when making decisions and plans as part of the ASR process. This occurred by giving CYP the opportunity to engage with the careers worker throughout the school year in preparation for the ASR process, as well as when considering the appropriateness of provision and alternative or work based placements. However, SENCo B argued that ‘adults have a duty of care for CYP’, which influenced how instrumental CYP could be in the plan and/or outcome of the ASR process. If it was felt that CYPs’ needs were not being met and they were not cooperating with adults by adhering to a plan that they had participated in and agreed to, then adults would have little choice but to make decisions for the CYP. Child C certainly reflected how the feeling that his ‘views [would be] taken into consideration by adults’. He expressed that his views would inform adults in their plans to support him, and that although he did not attend the ASR meeting his views should be considered in a process focusing on him and his needs.

4.5.4.3 Research question 3: Proposition (c)

CYP will be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process.

SENCo A felt that a primary outcome of the attendance of CYP at their ASR meeting would be that they could ‘develop an understanding of their support system’. SENCo B shared a similar view in the special provision of aiming for ‘positive outcomes of participation in the ASR meeting’, whereby it was hoped that CYP would feel that adults were interested in them, and they could see that they were being supported and could access this support system if they needed to. SENCo B also wanted CYP to gain a sense of moving forwards and an understanding of a plan for their future. Another key aim of enabling CYP to attend their ASR meeting for SENCo A was viewed to be an ‘opportunity for CYP to show positive attributes and skills’, and for them to be seen in a positive light by those who would be making decisions about them. SENCo A expected that participating in the ASR would be a ‘positive experience for CYP’, and they would view the aim of their participation to share their triumphs with those present.
In the resource based provision, SENCo A reported that decisions in the ASR process, particularly in reference to the transition to high school, were made by adults, hence ‘CYP informed of decisions made by adults’. Although the views of CYP were usually gathered and listened to as part of the process, the adults made the final decision and CYP were not expectant of being most influential in the decision-making process. SENCo A expressed that there would be times when the view of the CYP would be not be sought as part of the ASR process with regard to their choice of high school, for example if there was any controversy about the CYP’s placement and whereby adults would most certainly be making a decision together with regard to most suitable provision.

There was no mechanism in place in the resource based provision to ensure that CYP received feedback after the meeting whereby they would be informed of the content and outcomes of the ASR meeting, and this was assumed that any necessary information would be shared with CYP informally through their class teacher or parent. This was also the case according to findings from SENCo B in the special provision, as it was reported that feedback as part of the ‘follow-up after the ASR meeting’ was not officially given to CYP. Child C suggested that he ‘valued adult feedback after the ASR meeting’, as he reported that he actively sought out feedback from both his mother and SENCo B.

It was evident in the special provision that SENCo B was aware of ‘individual needs of parents’, and shared that she would need to take these needs into consideration when planning the ASR process in addition to planning the participation of CYP in the process. In the special provision parents were referred to as ‘important in the ASR process’ in terms of being influential in the plan and/or outcomes, in addition to the LA which was also the case in the resource based provision as described in the subthemes ‘adults have a duty of care for CYP’ and ‘role of LA in decision-making’.
Chapter 5 - Discussion

5.1 Chapter Overview

Following extensive cross-case comparisons, this final chapter provides the reader with a discussion of the findings from the current research project. The researcher will answer the three research questions that were developed in the initial stages of the research following an extensive and comprehensive literature review. The answers to the research questions are structured according to the propositions made for each research question. The researcher then gives consideration to the implications of the current findings for theory, practice and research, with these views outlined in this final chapter.

5.2 Research Question 1

5.2.1 CYP will have their say

It was proposed that ASR processes would be designed for CYP with SEBD to ‘have their say’ in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs. As detailed in the cross case comparison, the findings suggest that this was the case for both provisions, therefore the evidence is supportive of this proposition. In both provisions CYP were given warning of when the ASR would take place, which would give them time to prepare for their opportunity to attend and share their views. This process of gathering the views of CYP through use of the ‘My Review’ worksheet appeared to be reasonably embedded in both provisions, with both SENCos and CYP who participated being familiar with the document and what was required.

In terms of CYP having the opportunity to share their views in person by attending the ASR meeting, in the resource based provision such processes appeared to be fairly embedded. Findings suggest that CYP at the resource based provision had historically been invited to attend their ASR meeting on a more frequent basis in comparison to those in the special provision. It was known to the researcher that in the special provision this aspect of the ASR process was in the early stages of development. CYP were only recently being invited to attend their ASR meeting on a regular basis, with their attendance being
given a higher sense of importance than in recent times. SENCo B was keen to improve the participation of CYP in the ASR processes at school.

It was felt that in the resource based provision the attendance of CYP at their ASR meeting was coordinated and highly prioritised due to their agreement to take part in the research, as well as the influence of the researcher being present throughout the ASR process. As the researcher worked for Epton LA as a TEP, both provisions may have felt the need to demonstrate what they viewed to be good practice, which in the reality of daily demands at school may not always be the case. As the special provision were open about being in the early stages of developing their ASR processes to further include CYP, it was felt by the researcher that they viewed their taking part in the research to be a method of gaining feedback on the initial stages of their development in this area. Although it was likely that the attendance of CYP was prioritised at the time of the research, it was felt that this would be the case regardless of whether the research was taking place.

Based on professional knowledge and data gathered from each provision, it would appear that the organisation of ASR meetings would be slightly more straightforward for primary school aged children than those of secondary school age. CYP of secondary school age would have a more variable timetable than younger children, meaning they would be in different places at different times, and sometimes off the school site, for example for work experience. According to contextual data gathered in relation to the special provision, there was a wide range of alternative work and college placements on offer to CYP, meaning they could be quite often away from school. This would result in a considerable amount of difficulty organising the ASR to suit the commitments of every single person requested to attend, including the CYP. However, the researcher would argue that a high level of importance and priority being placed on the CYP being able to attend their ASR meeting could challenge this barrier.

5.2.2 Adults will determine the level of participation for CYP

It was proposed by the researcher that adults would determine the level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process. Findings demonstrate that regardless of whether CYP attended their ASR meeting, their views in the three areas of review, planning and decision-making would
always be sought through use of ‘My Review’, and submitted to the LA as part of the outcome documentation as requested which was determined by adults in the ASR process. In both the resource based and special provisions, it was clear that in the main the SENCo planned and determined the level of participation of each CYP and it appeared that this was done on an individual basis. However, particularly with secondary school aged children in the special provision adults tended to follow the child's lead wherever possible within the ASR process, in terms of the level of participation CYP were willing to cooperate with. In summary following the cross-case comparisons, the evidence for this proposition was found to be supportive in part. Therefore, the researcher proposes a revised proposition as follows:

The level of participation of CYP with SEBD in planning, review and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process is planned by adults on an individual basis.

In the literature, Aston & Lambert (2010) referred to CYP being invited to attend their ASR to participate in what they viewed to be a tokenistic manner, which they described as CYP being in attendance to listen to adults, and that they would maybe be given the opportunity to agree with decisions made for them by adults. However, in the view of Aston & Lambert (2010) this was not true participation. The researcher suggests that Aston & Lambert’s (2010) view of participation in the ASR may have been reflected in what was found with regard to the resource based provision specifically, had the researcher only observed the CYP at the key stages throughout their ASR process. However, through triangulation of data, it was evident that the way in which CYP were invited to participate in their ASR was thought through and purposeful on the part of the school whilst keeping what they viewed to be the best interests of the CYP at the centre of the process.

The researcher observed a specific example of the level of involvement a CYP might have in decisions made during the ASR process in the resource based provision, whereby Child A made a request for further integration into mainstream provision so that he could learn Spanish. SENCo A involved Child A in the decision-making up to a point, as she asked him questions regarding his request. However, Child A was told that he would be informed of whether this was possible once adults had made the decision.

Within reason, this is a positive example of participation in the ASR process. It is equitable to suggest that adults would need to make the final decision regarding the possibility of
Child A being able to be integrated into mainstream for Spanish, due to practical measures needing to be taken into consideration, for example availability. It was felt that Child A had the opportunity to make this request due to being present at the meeting, and also due to his confidence, feeling familiar and comfortable with those present, and perhaps his level of understanding with regard to the purpose of the ASR meeting.

However, generally speaking, SENCo A at the resource based provision wanted to avoid CYP being present for, or involved with, decision-making discussions, with specific reference to those made about transition to secondary school. This avoidance was based on SENCo A’s view, that ultimately the LA and parents would make the decision regarding provision for secondary school for CYP with a statement of SEN. Hence, there would be little point in including CYP in this discussion, regardless of their choice, as it would not be viewed by SENCo A to be influential in the decision-making.

This finding is reflective of literature that was reviewed in this area, as Kane et al. (2003) found that primary school staff shared a view that CYPs’ ability to participate in decision-making would increase as they matured. Perhaps as a consequence of this view, primary school staff also believed that participation would be more likely to occur when CYP were of secondary age. Hence, it appears that the current findings related to CYP with SEBD are similar to those found for mainstream CYP. SENCo A made the suggestion that things might be ‘different’ for CYP in secondary provision, not in reference to decision-making, but in reference to their ability to cope with being present for negative discussion. However, even this is not suggesting that CYP would be more able to ‘participate’, but merely to be present.

The researcher questions the understanding and view of participation of the adults involved in the ASR process and how this could have impacted on the level of participation that CYP were allowed determined by the SENCo. The researcher felt that SENCo A believed that she had the best interests of CYP at heart in her plans for their participation. However, as argued by Sellman (2009) in the literature, participation can be an opportunity for CYP to be genuinely empowered, in addition to simply being heard. It was recognised by Sellman (2009), that for CYP to be genuinely empowered through participation opportunities, a significant cultural transformation is usually required. Similarly, it has been recognised in the literature that participation of CYP could be improved by increased senior management support, as well as having a specific job role to
support participation of CYP (Davey, Lea, Shaw & Burke, 2010a). Evidence of the impact of such a change was found in the special provision, which will be discussed further.

5.2.3 Adults will feel the need to protect CYP

It was proposed that adults would feel that they needed to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have had a negative impact on them. A sense of protection over the CYP was particularly evident in the resource based provision, perhaps due to the CYP being younger than those mainly referred to by SENCo B and those who took part from the special provision. On reflection of the findings from the special provision that primarily focused on secondary age pupils, it would appear that although there was reference to maintaining a positive experience for CYP attending their ASR meeting, the sense of needing to protect them from all negativity was certainly not as apparent. Hence, this proposition is supported in part by the evidence provided from the current findings. Therefore, the researcher proposes a revised proposition as follows:

*Adults feel the need to protect CYP with SEBD from discussion during aspects of the ASR process that may have a negative impact on them in resource based provision. However the extent that this is influential on the level of participation is variable between the resource based and special provision.*

Although SENCo B was in the early stages of developing the ASR processes to include the participation of CYP, those attending their ASR meeting (particularly secondary school age CYP) were being given the opportunity to participate in decision-making and planning around their needs, and by sharing their views using the ‘My Review’ worksheet, they were also given the opportunity to participate in the review aspect of their ASR meeting. If a CYP did not wish to be present at their ASR meeting, SENCo B would include the views of the CYP in decision-making. The findings suggest that flexibility within the relatively fixed process can enable participation of CYP.

In the literature, Norwich & Kelly (2006) suggested that they found a tension between adults wanting to enable CYP to participate and a sense of protectiveness. The current findings clearly contribute to this already existing literature, with particularly SENCo A making reference to protecting CYP from threats to their self esteem, and asking too much of them when considering their ability to contribute to decision-making, planning and
review aspects of the ASR meeting. As suggested by the researcher in the literature review, feeling protective over CYP in the ASR process could result in advantages including spending additional time and effort in planning the process, preparing CYP for their participation, and as a consequence empowering CYP to have their say and contribute to the relevant parts of the ASR meeting. However, the researcher only found evidence of the potential disadvantage of feeling protective of CYP participating in the ASR process. This resulted in their opportunity to participate being limited and their views being shared with no real sense of purpose in terms of their impact on the process or outcome of the ASR.

From a critical realist perspective, the researcher would suggest that all people involved in the process, including CYP, parents, school staff and professionals, should have their say and these views should be listened to and given a sense of importance. Hence, the sense of protectiveness of CYP and their self-esteem and capabilities to participate should be used to its’ advantage. Thereby influencing systems in school to plan and prepare for their participation so that the experience can continue to be positive, but improved in the way that it is meaningful to the CYP.

5.3 Research Question 2

5.3.1 Personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD will affect their ability to participate

It was proposed that personal attributes and circumstances of CYP with SEBD would impact on their ability to participate throughout the ASR process, and some of these could be referred to as facilitators to their participation. In the resource based provision it was found that SENCo A considered personal attributes and circumstances of CYP when planning their participation in the ASR meeting. SENCo B found it difficult to share her views on what helped CYP to participate in the special provision, as the involvement of CYP in the ASR process was in the early stages of development at the time of the research. However, SENCo B recognised that CYP need to feel empowered to engage in decision-making, rather than feeling things just happen to them. In summary, the researcher found evidence that was supportive of this proposition.
The researcher argues that although some preparation for CYP was found to be taking place in both the resource based and special provision, there was room for improvement in this area for both. According to the literature, Ross & Egan (2004) argued that by adequately preparing CYP for participation in an initial mental health assessment appointment their anxiety would be reduced, the therapeutic benefit of the session would be increased, and their actual attendance would be more likely to occur. In addition, Paul (2004) concentrated on the importance of preparing CYP to be involved with making decisions, by their parents and professionals giving them time, advice and support to encourage them to feel that they are partners in the decision-making process. Hence, the researcher would suggest that it would be important to prepare CYP even for the preparation for the meeting, informing them of the purpose of the preparation so that it is as meaningful and beneficial as possible, and to improve the likelihood of the CYP engaging and participating at all.

Perhaps embedding processes in the special and resourced provision to prepare CYP for participating in the ASR meeting would contribute to increasing participation of CYP in the ASR process in the future, as CYP would have the opportunity to become practiced in contributing to and attending the ASR meetings from a younger age. If CYP develop the skills required to attend and participate in the ASR meeting, which is a relatively fixed process with specific outcomes that are statutory requirements, when they reach transitional and significant points in their education, they will be more prepared to engage and empowered to make a difference for themselves.

5.3.2 CYP will offer invaluable insight into what supports their participation

It was proposed that CYP with SEBD would offer invaluable insight into what helped them to participate in the ASR process, through sharing their thoughts on the ASR process and their participation and role within it. A range of insightful information provided by the CYP who took part in the research provided evidence in support of this proposition. As detailed in the cross-case comparison, feeling comfortable and confident helped some of the CYP to participate in the ASR meeting. All three CYP believed to some extent that their views were important in the ASR process, which was likely to have motivated them to take part by at least sharing their views using the ‘My Review’ worksheet.
Child C chose not to attend his ASR meeting based on previous experiences, however clearly demonstrated that he still wanted to be a part of the process, and that his views should be included. This was extremely insightful to the researcher, as one could assume that if a CYP did not want to attend their ASR they may have very little interest in the process itself. This certainly was not the case with Child C, who went out of his way to find out about the outcomes of the ASR meeting, and participated in the preparation for the ASR with a good level of understanding regarding what he was sharing his views for. With flexibility in the process Child C was able to fulfil his need and desire to participate in the way he felt most comfortable and share his views. SENCo B clearly played a role in making this possible for Child C by enabling flexibility and allowing Child C to in some ways take the lead in the way in which he was willing to participate in the process.

All CYP who took part demonstrated a level of either trust in the adults involved in the ASR process, or an understanding of the power imbalance between the two, which evidently resulted in adults holding more power in the ASR process. The researcher found the relationship between CYP and adults in the process to be important in maintaining a positive view of their own experience of the process. All CYP who took part in the research felt they were listened to, and trusted that the adults would take their views into account when any decisions were made. This goes against previous literature, suggesting that particularly older CYP report feeling that they are not listened to in decisions made at school (Burke, Davey, Shaw & Lea, 2010). The researcher did not come across any situation where a CYP expressed views or wishes that were significantly different to those of the adults; therefore there was no specific opportunity for CYP to be disappointed due to their belief that adults would take their views into account. The researcher argues that again, preparation for the ASR meeting would overcome the challenge that any disagreement such as this would occur. However, it is acknowledged that this level of preparation would take additional time and resources, as suggested in the literature (Golding, Dent, Nissim, & Stott, 2006).
5.4 Research Question 3

5.4.1 Participation of CYP will consist of them sharing their views

It was proposed by the researcher that the participation of CYP in the ASR process would consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs. In both the special and resource based provisions CYP were invited to share their views in each of these three areas using the ‘My Review’ worksheet. These views would then be submitted as part of the outcome documentation to the LA. All three CYP who took part in the research demonstrated a sense of value in sharing their views and having the opportunity to participate in the ASR process in their individual ways. Adults in both provisions referred to the importance of gathering the views of CYP as specified by the LA as part of the ASR process.

There was evidence of Child A initiating further participation, arguably due to his own confidence and understanding of the process. Child C chose not to attend his ASR meeting, which effectively limited his opportunities to participate in the ASR process. However, with adults being flexible in the relatively fixed process Child C was able to be involved in a way that he felt comfortable. This enabled him to participate in preparatory processes with the careers worker to inform decision making at the stage of the ASR, share his views using the My Review worksheet, and seek out information regarding the outcomes of the meeting. Although Child B engaged as requested by adults in the ASR process, he allowed adults to take the lead, which resulted in limited participation other than the sharing of his views.

On consideration of the cross case comparisons the researcher found the proposition to be supported by the data, however the proposition was viewed to be limiting. Although the views of CYP were gathered and processes to achieve this were reasonably embedded in both provisions, the data suggests that CYP had opportunities to participate further in the ASR process. The original proposition therefore was revised slightly as follows:

*The participation of CYP with SEBD will primarily consist of them sharing their views in the three areas of planning, review and decision-making around their needs, with CYP having opportunities to participate further in the ASR process.*
5.4.2 Adults will take the views of CYP into consideration when making decisions

It was proposed by the researcher that adults would take the views of CYP into consideration when they made decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR process. In the resource based provision, it was clear to the researcher during observations that parents/carers were keen to keep their CYP’s views included in the decision-making with regard to secondary school. As previously discussed, SENCo A at the resource based provision suggested that CYP were given the opportunity to ‘participate’ in the ASR by sharing their views. However, CYP being present for decision-making discussions was actually avoided due to the understanding that the most important view with regard to future secondary school placement would be the LA and parents. Despite the school’s stance of CYP’s views and how influential they would be in decisions made, CYP who took part demonstrated a sense of trust in adults and felt that their views would be taken into account. Evidently it was important in the special provision, particularly in reference to the older CYP who participated and were referred to during contextual data gathering, for them to be on board with decision-making in terms of their cooperation with the plan in some cases.

After consideration of the cross-case comparisons, it is evident that the findings offer support in part for the original proposition; therefore the researcher revised the initial proposition as follows:

*Adults will sometimes listen to the views of CYP in relation to decisions and plans involving their needs as part of the ASR, however the extent to which these views are taken into consideration is variable between the resource based and special provisions.*

Faupel & Sharp (2003) found that CYP with SEBD tended to externalise their behaviour as a way of communicating their goals and needs to teachers. Sellman (2009) argued that CYP with SEBD use their behaviour as a way of communicating and making themselves heard, which perhaps could be due to not being given the opportunity to be heard in other more socially acceptable ways. Hence, the researcher would suggest that including CYP with SEBD in the decision-making and planning aspects of the ASR might contribute to supporting their SEBD. However, as demonstrated through an example given by SENCo B, for some CYP they find that they are unable to engage or cooperate with opportunities
given to them that allow them to participate in decision-making and planning around their needs as part of the ASR, and choose to continue to use their socially inappropriate behaviour as a way of communication.

On the surface as the views of CYP were gathered as part of the process, this would suggest that they would also be being taken into account. The researcher is unable to conclude on the extent to which they were taken into account, as the LA was not part of the research project. However based on the current findings, the researcher suggests that although there are particular times and situations where the views shared by CYP in the ‘My Review’ worksheet are likely to be more influential in the decision-making process than others, adults continue to have the final say regarding how the CYP’s needs will be met through the statement of SEN. The researcher would argue that this situation of an individual being given the opportunity to share their views, however not being as influential as others in the decision-making process, is reasonably common throughout life, for example when organisational decisions are made that will directly affect employees in the workplace. As a critical realist, it was important for the researcher to reflect on common ways of working in society in comparison to what was found within this focused and exploratory case study.

According to the current findings from the resource based provision, the reason for CYP not being influential in the decision-making process were suggested to be due to the perceived magnitude of the decision regarding appropriate secondary school provision, and their ability as a CYP to engage with and contribute appropriately to such a decision. Interestingly, in the special provision CYP appeared to be more influential in the decisions made by adults in the ASR meeting.

The researcher found that in the special provision the views of CYP with regard to future placements, careers options or further education choices, were very much considered by adults in the decision-making process. Adults were considered by the researcher to be working alongside the CYP to help them to make a decision that was informed by up to date and relevant information primarily provided by the careers worker and school in terms of what was realistically available to them based on their personal circumstances and achievements so far. It appeared to be understood in the special provision with regard to CYP in the age group that would be giving serious consideration to their options after school, that they needed to be interested and on board with decisions made in order for
them to engage with these plans and decisions that were made. Perhaps this difference observed between the two provisions was due to the difference in age of the pupils. Alternatively, it is argued that this could have been to do with the differing attitude towards participation that was found between the two SENCos who were key to the ASR process in their provision.

In both the special and resource based provision, CYP had the ability to indirectly influence decision-making by adults through use of their behaviour. In the resource based provision, it was actually planned by adults to monitor how CYP coped with the plan that they put in place, which would influence the decision that they ultimately made together (school, parents and LA) with regard to their secondary school provision. In the special provision it was evident that CYP were welcomed to be involved in decision-making whereby adults would accommodate their choices up to the point where they considered it was their duty of care to the CYP to step in and make decisions on behalf of the CYP that would be in their best interests.

5.4.3 CYP will be informed of decisions made by adults

It was proposed in the initial stages of the research based on the literature that CYP would be informed regarding any plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process. The researcher found that despite the differences in the level of participation during decision-making and influence on the outcome of the ASR between the two provisions, CYP were ultimately to some extent informed regarding plans and/or outcomes following completion of the ASR process. The reason being that there is an unavoidable and in some ways necessary power imbalance between adults and CYP in schools, with adults being more powerful when it comes to decision-making with regard to CYPs’ needs and wellbeing whilst they are accessing their provision. Schools have a responsibility to meet the needs of CYP, and it is felt that this responsibility is even more so when CYP have SEN such as SEBD.

When the researcher refers to CYP as being ‘informed’, this is mainly from the view that decisions are ultimately made by adults for CYP in both the special and resource based provision, whether it is that CYP have minimal involvement other than being given the opportunity to share their views even though they may not necessarily influence the
decision, or it is that CYP are involved in the planning and decision-making and adults are in agreement with the choices that they have in some ways prepared them to make. In both the resource based and special provision, it was clear to the researcher that there was no real process to actually inform CYP of the outcomes of the ASR meeting, or offer them feedback. Although adults shared that they assumed that this would occur informally by class teachers and parents, other evidence collected such as interviews with CYP suggested that this might not always be the case. The researcher would suggest that mechanisms to provide CYP with feedback from the ASR meeting should be formally put in place, to improve the sense of their ‘participation’ in the process being meaningful, important and appreciated by adults.

Overall, following cross case comparisons the findings are found to be supportive in part with regard to the initial proposition, therefore the researcher made the subsequent revision:

Despite differences in the level of participation of CYP with SEBD throughout the ASR process between resource based and special provisions, resulting plans and/or outcomes are finalised by adults and CYP are ‘informed’.

5.5 Limitations and Improvements

When considering the limitations of the current research, it is proposed that as the LA were not involved as participants it was difficult to ascertain the extent that CYP’s views from the ASR were taken into account when the LA officer would make any final decisions and necessary changes to the statement of SEN. In hindsight, it may have been possible for the researcher to include two cases in the multiple case study design rather than three, and in addition to the original design as part of each case, the researcher could interview a member of the LA who has a key role in the ASR process in schools.

In the current multiple case study design the case was identified to be the CYP, however on reflection this may have been a limitation to the research. Had the researcher identified the context as the case, further focus on the school community and ethos, and the general perception of participation and how it was approached and received as a school would have been an additional dimension to contribute to the current research and findings.
The researcher discussed with each SENCo who took part in the research the possibility of supporting verbal discussion in the semi-structured interviews with CYP participants by using visual cues to facilitate their understanding and communication. Each SENCo felt that these visual aids would not be necessary for the CYP who had been identified as participants for the research; therefore the researcher did not employ this method. However, particularly with Child B, the researcher felt on reflection of the data gathering stage that visual aids could have been beneficial in supporting CYP to share their views. As the researcher got to know Child B throughout the ASR process it was evident that he was generally a very quiet pupil, therefore a verbal interview perhaps was not the best fit for this child. In retrospect, the researcher could have included the use of visual aids in the research design as a standard method to support the semi-structured interviews with all CYP. That way the researcher would hope that CYP would not feel singled out or uncomfortable about this additional support, as it would be standard with all participants regardless or their ability. By use of visual aids all CYP would be supported in their ability to understand, reflect and communicate, which would contribute to providing a comprehensive and reliable account of their views as part of the research.

Despite the limitations of the current research identified in this section, the multiple case study design and chosen methodology provided rich and comprehensive data to inform each of the three research questions.

5.6 Implications for Theory

In Chapter 2 the researcher introduced the synthesised model of participation (fig. 2.1, section 2.3.3), which was developed by combining what the researcher found to be the key aspects of the three most influential models so far in the literature. As previously described, this model was then used to inform data gathering and to guide data analysis, specifically the content analysis.

Part of the synthesised model of participation which was adopted from Shier’s (2001) model of participation, made reference to whether an organisation enabled participation due to openings, opportunities or obligations. This part of Shier’s (2001) model had originally underpinned the key aspects rather than being a central component. On reflection of initially including this part of Shier’s (2001) model as a central aspect of the
synthesised model of participation (fig. 2.1), the researcher found that in the current research it was not useful for coding the observed data in this way to inform this exploratory multiple case study. The current research was investigating a statutory process that was clearly governed by national and local policy. Hence, whether participatory practice was enabled through openings, opportunities or obligations was not necessarily a focus of the current research, therefore it was felt that it would be best excluded from the model which reflects the practice in the current research. Research investigating processes or phenomena that was not as clearly governed by policy or procedure may benefit from continuing to consider the dimension of openings, opportunities or obligations as a key feature of participatory practice, as demonstrated in the original synthesised model (see fig. 2.1).

On reflection the researcher found that the categories ‘participation – assigned’ and ‘participation – adult initiated’ were very similar in the way that they would be coded, and more often than not both would be coded for the same piece of data, hence these two categories were combined as one. Fig. 5.1 is a revised version of the synthesised model of participation (see fig. 2.1 in section 2.3.3 for the original version of the synthesised model). The researcher found the model extremely useful to inform data gathering and then analyse the data using content analysis. An important addition for the researcher was to highlight the importance of considering the influences taking place on the level of participation overall, the level of decision-making, and CYP being enabled to ‘have a voice’. The researcher has highlighted many of these influences in the findings of the current research. Each category now shown in fig. 5.1 would be useful to investigate any process involving CYP and categorising
Fig. 5.1 Revised synthesised model of participation (adapted from existing models by Hart, (1992), Treseder (1997) and Shier (2001)).
5.7 Implications for Practice

The researcher set out to make recommendations based on some of the key findings from the current research that could contribute to a good practice model, and these can be found in table 5.1. In review of the current findings in relation to each proposition for each research question, the researcher identified the most significant findings in relation to implications for practice, to inform good practice recommendations as an outcome of the current research. In addition to the practice observed through the current research, the researcher gave particular consideration to the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) when considering practice. Selecting one key finding from each research question resulted in the researcher being able to represent highlights from the range of information gathered from the research project, rather than for example focusing on the findings from one of the research questions in more detail.

The key finding for research question 1 was the ‘importance of preparation for the ASR meeting for CYP with SEBD’. For research question 2 the most significant finding related to practice was the ‘factors considered to be important when planning the participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process’. Finally for research question 3, the key finding was selected as ‘identifying a process for sharing plans and/or outcomes of the ASR with CYP with SEBD following completion of the ASR process’.

Table 5.1 Recommendations for good practice when encouraging the participation of CYP in aspects of review, planning and decision-making around their needs in the ASR process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research finding</th>
<th>Recommendation for good practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Research Question 1**  
Importance of preparation for the ASR meeting for CYP with SEBD | • CYP are fully informed with accessible information (e.g. conversation with a familiar adult, written information, visual aids) of the purpose of the ASR process.  
• CYP are given the opportunity to explore the advantages and disadvantages of their attendance and participation at the ASR meeting.  
• CYP are given the opportunity to engage with specific adults, e.g. careers worker or learning mentor, to engage in planning and decision-making processes. This is to promote the development of negotiation and decision-making skills that would be beneficial in the ASR meeting format if they agreed to attend. The concept of attending these meetings/sessions could be made clear to CYP, to contribute to preparing them for the ASR process.  
• CYP are given the opportunity to learn skills in reflecting on |
their own strengths, difficulties, achievements and areas for development, so that they can contribute meaningfully to the review aspect of the ASR process, as well as develop familiarity with this way of thinking.

- CYP are prepared for the content of the ASR meeting through use of an agenda, they are prepared to consider and rehearse their chosen level of participation in each of the areas of the agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors considered when planning the participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors currently considered by adults in special and resource based provision included the age of CYP, family circumstances and potential reaction from parents, and protecting CYP from negative experiences. Such considerations should be made whilst planning the participation of CYP to meet the following recommendations:

- CYP are given the opportunity to share their views in the way that they choose, whether this is personally or through a chosen adult.
- Discussion at the ASR meeting is planned and maintained by adults in a way that is appropriate for meeting the requirements of the ASR in addition to being appropriate for the CYP to be a part of in the view of a duty of care.
- CYP are made to feel comfortable, important and welcome, as all others in attendance are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a process for sharing plans and/or outcomes of the ASR with CYP with SEBD following completion of the ASR process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All CYP despite whether they attended or not are given feedback on the outcomes of the ASR in the appropriate format for their age and level of understanding, to promote a shared understanding with adults and encourage a sense of empowerment due to their own role in the process.
- CYP are given feedback to reassure them that they will continue to be a partner with adults in the review, planning and decision-making around their individual needs, and the process will continue throughout their time in the provision and not just at the time of the ASR meeting.

It is evident on reflection of the current findings that the perception of ‘participation’ and what this entails in the school setting, and in particular in the ASR process, can have a considerable impact on how CYP are enabled to participate. It is not only the view of participation of the key school staff members who are involved in the ASR process that could be challenged, but also the views of LAs, pupils and parents. Individual views of participation in the ASR process could be elicited by those involved and challenged as appropriate, and the potential positive outcomes of successful participation for CYP and adults could be shared amongst schools, parents and pupils who are associated with the ASR process. The researcher considers colleagues in the field of educational psychology to be well placed to put into effect such a process of understanding current views and challenging them, with a view to positive outcomes for CYP and making the most of current systems to the advantage of CYP and adults.
5.8 Implications for Research

In consideration of the potential focus of future research as a progression from the current findings, the researcher suggests that a wide-scale survey in specialist provision for CYP with SEBD would be most useful. The survey would aim to establish the possible range of what is occurring in general for participation of CYP with SEBD in the ASR process, and how it is occurring. A wide-scale survey would provide more information regarding general practice in specialist provision for SEBD, and evidence with regard to how this compares with findings from the current research in special and resource based provision.
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Appendix B – Participant information sheet for identified school staff member (SENCo)
Looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

Participant Information Sheet for Adult Participants

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of a Postgraduate Doctoral thesis. Before you make a decision about whether you would like to be involved with the research, it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish to. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the study?
My name is Genevieve Kilroy and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist who is currently a student on the Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology programme at The University of Manchester. I will be conducting the study for my thesis, which I am required to carry out as part of my training. As I am a student at University of Manchester, my university tutor will be supervising my research.

Title of the study
The study is going to be looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

What is the aim of the study?
The aim of the study is to investigate how children and young people (CYP) with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBDs) are enabled to participate in the annual statement review (ASR) process, in order to be involved with decision making, planning and review of their needs. The study aims to also find out what works best in facilitating this participation, and how well the processes that are in place to facilitate participation work to include CYP with SEBDs’ views in the ASR process.

The findings from the study aim to be practical, and the researcher aims to be able make a contribution to recommending a strategy to develop practice within education systems to involve CYP with SEBDs in decision-making, planning and review cycles as part of the ASR process. This research would therefore be beneficial to practitioners supporting CYP with SEBDs in educational settings, in addition to the CYP themselves.

Why have I been chosen?
The focus of the study is CYP with SEBDs. therefore I have chosen to recruit participants from specialist and alternative provision for CYP with additional needs in order to meet the criteria for suitable participants. This study is investigating CYP and their participation in the ASR process, therefore it is important to have CYP as participants in this study in order for them to have their say about having a voice in these processes. I will also be collected data from you, as you have been identified as a key staff member in the school or place of learning in this ASR process for the individual children who have been recruited as participants. I will be meeting with you in order to gather information about the ASR process and to reflect on how participation of CYP is taking place.
**What would I be asked to do if I took part?**

I would like to meet with you in the school or place of learning that you work to carry out an interview prior to the ASR meeting that will be due to take place. This will be to find out about the ASR processes and how CYP are enabled to participate in these. The research term for this is interview, however it would be very informal in order to help you feel comfortable and at ease. I would like to discuss with you each individual child who has been invited to take part so that individualised planning for participation can be taken into account. If it is not possible to discuss each of the children in this one meeting we may take further shorted meetings to discuss each child.

Then I would like to observe the child during the time that they are supported by a member of staff to complete any ‘preparation’ for the ASR meeting, that will be due to take place in school. I would not be taking part at all in the activities being carried out; I would simply be an observer and making detailed notes on the participation of each individual child in this process.

I would then be observing the ASR meeting, which is arranged and facilitated by school; therefore again I would simply be an observer in this meeting and making detailed notes on what is happening during this time in terms of each child’s participation with the process.

After the ASR meeting, I would like to meet with the child to carry out an interview to discuss their views on their own participation within the ASR process. Depending on the length of time that they are involved in the ASR meeting, I will meet with the child either after 2-3 hours break, or the following day, to ensure that they are not overtired with the process. I might use some visual aids if this is appropriate, to help with communication during the interview, for example, a photograph of the room that we had the ASR meeting in, or visual representations of a range of emotions. I will be asking each child questions in ways that are appropriate for the age and level of ability, about how they felt at different times during the process, what they feel helped them to be involved, and how much they feel that their participation had an impact on decisions made and outcomes from the meeting.

A full risk assessment has been carried out, and after receiving full information on participating in the study, taking part in the study should not pose any risks to any of the participants. I would hope that it would be a pleasant experience, and participants being able to take breaks from the interview and ask the researcher any questions would support this.

If at any point you do not feel comfortable or do not want to answer a particular question, you will be free to refuse to answer, or withdraw from the entire interview and will not be expected to give an explanation if you do not want to. If after taking part in the interview you decide that you do not want your data to be used in the research, you are also free to withdraw this information. You just need to contact me using the contact details provided at the end of this information sheet.

**What happens to the data that is collected, and how is confidentiality maintained?**

All information will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside the research team. Audio recordings will be stored as audio files on a computer, then transcribed to a computer document and will by anonymised immediately. Therefore, participants will not be identifiable in the transcripts. All data will be destroyed once the research is complete and given approval by the university. All research materials (scripts, transcripts, data stick etc) will be stored in a locked drawer and electronic data will be stored on a password-protected computer.
The results of the study will inform a Doctoral Thesis, which is a requirement as part of the Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology programme. Participants will not be identifiable within the research assignment, as all data will be recorded anonymously. A summary of findings will be provided in written form that is appropriate for the different participant groups in the study. No names, addresses, or other identifying information will be used in any of these reports.

**What happens if I don't want to take part, or if I change my mind?**
It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not you would like to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason, and your decision will be respected and you will withdraw without any disadvantage to you.

**Will I be paid for participating in the study?**
There will not be any payment for participating in the study; therefore participation is on a voluntary basis. I will be providing refreshments for all participants, and I am going to be flexible in an attempt to arrange interview times at the most convenient time possible for them.

**What is the duration of the study?**
You will be taking part in the ASR process as you normally would, which will be arranged and facilitated by school and I will observe throughout this process. I will require you to meet with me before each ASR review that is going to be observed as part of the research (approximately 6 in each school or place of learning). When you take part in first the interview with me it last for approximately 45 minutes. For the following ASR reviews I may require to meet with you prior to the meetings commencing, however these meetings will be much shorter as they will be focused specifically on the child that will be taking part that day and the plan for the ASR meeting, as opposed to participation in general. Should these remaining meetings be necessary, they may last for approximately 20 minutes, and will take place prior to the ASR meeting for each child that has been invited to take part in the research. Hence, in summary I will be asking you to take part in 1 interview for no more than 45 minutes, and potentially 5 meetings prior to each ASR meeting for no more than 20 minutes each. These meetings will take place on the days that are arranged by school for the ASR reviews for the children who have been invited to take part in the research. Only the initial interview will be recorded using an audio recorder.

**Where will the study be conducted?**
The study will be conducted in the school or place of learning that you work, with observations being carried out in settings chosen by school and the interviews being carried out in a private room to maintain confidentiality.

**Will the outcomes of the study be published?**
The details of this study will be written up and published as a Doctoral thesis.

**Criminal Records Check**
I have undergone a satisfactory criminal records check, which is necessary to be carried out with anyone who is going to come into contact with children or vulnerable adults in their work.

**Contact for further information**
If you would like further information about the research project, please contact me (Genevieve Kilroy) using the following contact details:
genevieve.kilroy@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
XXXX XXX XXXX (Epton Educational Psychology & Portage Service)

Alternatively, please contact my university tutor who will be supervising my research, using the following contact details:
Prof. Kevin Woods
kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk
0161 275 3511 (Jackie Chisnall, Programme Administrator, University of Manchester)

What if something goes wrong?
If you have any concerns about the way the project is conducted, or have any complaints, please contact me in the first instance (Genevieve Kilroy) and I will do my best to resolve any concerns you may have. However, if the problems are not resolved or you would like to comment in any way, please contact my project supervisor. In addition to the above contact information, my supervisor can be contacted at the following address:

School of Education
Ellen Wilkinson Building
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9PL

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to:

The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office
Christie Building
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9PL

By emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk

Or by telephoning:
0161 275 7583 or 275 8093
Appendix C – Consent form for identified adult school staff member (SENCo)
Looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate in the research project please complete and sign the consent form below

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. I understand that there will be no payment of any out-of-pocket expenses, or any other kind of payment.

3. I understand that my interview will be audio recorded and that the researcher will take written notes during the interview and the observations carried out in the preparation for and during the Annual Statement Review meeting.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes for when the research is written up.

6. I agree that any anonymised data collected may be passed to other researchers.

7. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project.

__________________________________________  __________  __________
Name of participant            Date                  Signature

__________________________________________  __________  __________
Name of person taking consent  Date                  Signature
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Appendix D – Child-friendly invitation to take part in the research
Hi, my name is Genevieve. I am hoping to do some research in your school to find out about how you get to have your say about plans, reviews and decisions that are made about you. I really need the views of children and young people to be able to find out what your experiences are.

I have given your parent/carer a consent form and information about this research that I am doing. I have given your parent/carer a consent form and information about this research that I am doing. Please can you talk to them about this and if you would like to take part they can complete the consent form and hand it in at school.

THANK YOU for your time!

I really need the views of children and young people to be able to find out what your experiences are.

I will be able to meet with you at school at a time that suits you.

THANK YOU for your time!

I really need the views of children and young people to be able to find out what your experiences are.

Would you mind if I came alone to your school to see how you are involved with decision-making at your school?

I really need the views of children and young people to be able to find out what your experiences are.

At your annual statement review, what you think helps you, and how much you feel your views are heard and have an impact.

At your annual statement review, what you think helps you, and how much you feel your views are heard and have an impact.

Have your say! Children and Young People

Hi, my name is Genevieve. I am hoping to do some research in your school to find out about how you get to have your say about plans, reviews and decisions that are made about you.
Appendix E – Participant information sheet for parents of CYP invited to take part
Looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

Participant Information Sheet for Parents

Your child is being invited to take part in a study as part of a Postgraduate Doctoral Thesis. Before you make a decision about whether you would like your child to be involved with the research, it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish to. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish for your child to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the study?
My name is Genevieve Kilroy and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist, currently a student on the Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology programme at The University of Manchester. I will be conducting the study for my thesis, which I am required to carry out as part of my training. As I am a student at The University of Manchester, my university tutor will be supervising my research.

Title of the study
The study is going to be looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process.

What is the aim of the study?
The aim of the study is to investigate how children and young people (CYP) with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) are enabled to participate in the annual statement review (ASR) process, in order to be involved with decision making, planning and review of their needs. The study aims to also find out what works best in facilitating this participation, and how well the processes that are in place to facilitate participation work to include CYP with SEBDs’ views in the ASR process.

The findings from the study aim to be practical, and the researcher aims to be able make a contribution to recommending a strategy to develop practice within education systems to involve CYP with SEBD in decision-making, planning and review cycles as part of the ASR process. This research would therefore be beneficial to practitioners supporting CYP with SEBD in educational settings, in addition to the CYP themselves.

Why has my child been chosen?
The focus of the study is CYP with SEBD. Therefore I have chosen to recruit participants from specialist and alternative provision for CYP with additional needs in order to meet the criteria for suitable participants. This study is investigating CYP and their participation in the ASR process, therefore it is important to have CYP as participants in this study in order for them to have their say about having a voice in these processes. I will also be collected data from a key staff member in your child’s school or place of learning, in order to gather information about the ASR process and reflect on how participation of CYP is taking place.
What would my child be asked to do if they took part?
Firstly I am going to meet with the key member of staff in your child’s school or place of learning to carry out an interview to find out about the ASR processes and how CYP are enabled to participate.

Then I would like to observe your child during the time that they are supported by a member of staff to complete any ‘preparation’ for the ASR meeting that is due to take place in school. I won’t be taking part at all in the activities being carried out with your child by school, I will simply be an observer and making detailed notes on your child’s participation in this process.

Then I would be observing the ASR meeting, which you are likely to also have been invited to attend by school. This meeting is arranged and facilitated by school; therefore again I will simply be an observer in this meeting and making detailed notes on what is happening during this time in terms of your child’s participation with the process.

After the ASR meeting, I would like to meet with your child to discuss their views on their own participation within the ASR process. The research term for this is an interview, however it is very informal in order to support your child to feel comfortable and at ease. Depending on the length of time that they are involved in the ASR meeting, I will meet with your child either after 2-3 hours break, or the following day, to ensure that they are not overtired with the process. I might use some visual aids if this is appropriate, to help with communication during the interview, for example, a photograph of the room that we had the ASR meeting in, or visual representations of a range of emotions. I will be asking you child questions in ways that are appropriate for the age and level of ability, about how they felt at different times during the process, what they feel helped them to be involved, and how much they feel that their participation had an impact on decisions made and outcomes from the meeting.

A full risk assessment has been carried out, and after receiving full information on participating in the study, being observed and taking part in the interview should not pose any risks to your child if they take part. I would hope that it would be a pleasant experience, and participants being able to take breaks from the interview and ask the researcher any questions would support this.

If at any point your child does not feel comfortable or does not want to answer a particular question, they will be free to refuse to answer, or withdraw from the entire interview and will not be expected to give an explanation if they do not want to. If after taking part in the interview you or your child decides that they do not want their data to be used in the research, they are also free to withdraw this information. You just need to contact me using the contact details provided at the end of this information sheet.

What happens to the data that is collected, and how is confidentiality maintained?
All information will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside the research team. Audio recordings will be stored as audio files on a computer, then transcribed to a computer document and will by anonymised immediately. Therefore, the participant will not be identifiable in the transcript. All data will be destroyed once the research is complete and given approval by the university. All research materials (scripts, transcripts, data stick etc) will be stored in a locked drawer and electronic data will be stored on a password-protected computer.

The results of the study will inform a Doctoral Thesis, which is a requirement as part the Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology programme. Participants will not be
identifiable within the research assignment, as all data will be recorded anonymously. A summary of findings will be provided in written form that is appropriate for the different participant groups in the study. No names, addresses, or other identifying information will be used in any of these reports.

**What happens if I don’t want my child to take part, my child doesn't want to take part, or if my child or I change our minds?**

It is entirely up to you and your child to decide whether or not you would like your child to take part. If you do decide for your child to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason, and your decision will be respected without any disadvantage to you or your child.

**Will my child or I be paid for participating in the study?**

There will not be any payment for participating in the study; therefore participation is on a voluntary basis. I will be providing refreshments for all participants, and I am going to be flexible in an attempt to arrange interview times at the most convenient time possible for them.

**What is the duration of the study?**

Your child will be taking part in the ASR process as they normally would, which will be arranged and facilitated by school and I will observe throughout this process. Then your child will take part in 1 interview with me that will last for no longer than 30 minutes.

**Where will the study be conducted?**

The study will be conducted in the school or place of learning that your child attends, with observations being carried out in settings chosen by school and the interviews being carried out in a private room to maintain confidentiality.

**Will the outcomes of the study be published?**

The details of this study will be written up and published as a Doctoral thesis.

**Criminal Records Check**

I have undergone a satisfactory criminal records check, which is necessary to be carried out with anyone who is going to come into contact with children or vulnerable adults in their work.

**Contact for further information**

If you would like further information about the research project, please contact me (Genevieve Kilroy) using the following contact details:

genevieve.kilroy@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

XXXX XXX XXXX (Sefton Educational Psychology & Portage Service)

Alternatively, please contact my university tutor who will be supervising my research, using the following contact details:

Prof. Kevin Woods
kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk

0161 275 3511 (Jackie Chisnall, Programme Administrator, University of Manchester)

**What if something goes wrong?**

If you have any concerns about the way the project is conducted, or have any complaints, please contact me in the first instance (Genevieve Kilroy) and I will do my best to resolve any concerns you may have. However, if the problems are not resolved or you would like to comment in any way, please contact my project supervisor. In
addition to the above contact information, my supervisor can be contacted at the following address:

School of Education
Ellen Wilkinson Building
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9PL

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to:

The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office
Christie Building
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9PL

By emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk

Or by telephoning:
0161 275 7583 or 275 8093
Appendix F – Consent forms completed by parents and CYP of those invited to take part in the research
Looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS/CARERS

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my child’s participation in the study is voluntary and that they are free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. I understand that there will be no payment of any out-of-pocket expenses, or any other kind of payment.

3. I understand that the interview with my child will be audio recorded and that the researcher will take written notes during the interview and the observations carried out in the preparation for and during the Annual Statement Review meeting

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes for when the research is written up

6. I agree that any anonymised data collected may be passed to other researchers if necessary e.g. supervision and guidance in research

7. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

If you are happy for your child to participate in the research project please complete and sign the consent form below

I agree to my child taking part in the above project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of parent/carer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the participation of children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties in decision making, planning and review around their needs in the annual statement review process

CONSENT FORM FOR CHILD/YOUNG PERSON

1. I have read the information sheet for children and young people about the research project and talked through the detailed information given to my parent/carer. I have been able to think about the information and have any of my questions answered

2. I understand that it is up to me if I want to take part in the research. If I agree now but change my mind later, this is fine and I just need to tell the researcher, or someone at school or my parent/carer who can pass this on to the researcher. I understand that I won't receive any money or gifts to take part

3. I understand that the researcher will record my interview and she will take written notes during the interview. She will also take written notes at the times she is watching the preparation for and during the Annual Statement Review meeting

4. I agree that when the researcher writes up her research she can use anonymous quotes from my interview or from during the preparation and the Annual Statement Review meeting that she is going to watch

6. I agree that the researcher can pass on information collected from me to other researchers that she is working with and who have an important reason to see the information. The information will be anonymous, which means that it will have everybody’s names taken off it including the name of my school, so nobody can identify me from reading it

7. I agree that any information collected during the preparation and the Annual Statement Review meeting or my interview may be published in anonymous form as part of the research in academic books or journals. Anonymous means it will have everybody’s names taken off it including the name of my school, so nobody can identify me from reading it

If you are happy to take part in the research project please read and sign the consent form below

I agree to take part in the above project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of child/young person</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G – Example of interview guide used with adult participants (SENCo A and B)
Interview Guide – Adult (Staff member)

Finding out about ASR processes

Planning

• What type of information/data is gathered before you have an ASR meeting for a child with primary need of a social, emotional and behavioural nature?
  o Why?
  o How is this done?
  o Who does this? (and why?)
  o Might this be different for each child or similar?

• Who is involved in designing the ASR meeting processes?

• How is the level of participation/opportunity to participate decided for each CYP?

• How does the CYP find out about the ASR, and the opportunities they have to participate?

• Are CYP involved in the preparation processes for the ASR meeting?

• Are there any processes for preparing the CYP to participate in the ASR?

• Who is invited to take part in the ASR and why?

• What do you feel is most effective in the processes in place for preparation for the ASR in facilitating participation for CYP?

ASR Meeting

• How do you tend to go about:
  o Reviewing progress and need
  o Decision making
    ▪ How and when are decisions made?
      o Planning for future (e.g. provision)

• What opportunities do CYP have to participate in:
  o Review
  o Decision making
  o Planning?

and why?
• Is there anything that anybody does, or anything about the processes in place for the ASR meetings that occurs with the purpose of enabling the CYP to participate in the ASR?
• What do CYP know about why they are being asked to be involved?
• How much of an impact do you feel that the CYP have the potential to have on decisions that are made around their needs?
  o What do the CYP understand about this?
• Out of those processes we have just discussed that are in place for the ASR meeting, what do you feel is most effective in facilitating participation for CYP?

After the ASR meeting
• What tends to take place after the meeting?
• How is feedback from the meeting given and who to?
• Will the CYP be de-briefed/talked to about their input?
• Will any decisions that have been made be explained to the CYP?
• Will it be explained to the CYP why their participation/voice was taken into consideration but not included in the plan/decision making, if this is the case?
• How is the plan implemented?

What are the things in the process that we have just talked about that you feel are most effective in enabling CYP to participate in the ASR process?

What do you feel is the optimum outcome of effectively enabling a CYP to participate in their ASR?
Appendix H – Example of transcript from interview carried out with SENCo A
(Case A)
General Questions

Ok, so I just wanted to ask you some questions generally about the annual statement review process and how it works in your school first of all. I want to ask about the types of information that you gather before the annual statement review meeting and who you take it from?

Oh right... [interruption] Well, depending on which professionals are involved with the child, we invite all the relevant professionals to the annual review, including the paediatricians who don’t usually come. But we then take reports off anyone who is involved with the child. We don’t usually have paediatrician reports but we have speech and language therapy reports, and if the educational psychologist has seen the child that year we’d have that report. Sometimes occupational therapy, sometimes if there’s a social worker involved, if the child is looked after, they wouldn’t necessarily provide a report but they would attend the meeting. And we invite those people to attend the meeting. And usually... the norm would be that we’d have the speech and language therapist, the class teacher, the parent (the parents fill in a parents comments sheet beforehand), and if it’s a transition review of if there’s any controversy about provision then we invite the statementing officer from the local authority.

Is the way you work the annual reviews at school quite flexible, or has it been done in a certain way for a while? And who developed the processes?

Well I suppose I developed the processes because I’ve been doing it for 20 years at this school. Well, I was mainstream and then I went to special needs about 15-16 years ago. So the processes have been like that for a long time. It’s the way our Local Authority Reviews are run. In the past, it used to be that someone from the Local Authority would come to most reviews. Whereas now they only tend to come if there’s a controversy or if it’s a transition review.

So they are run in the same way around Epton would you say?

I would say so yes
Because they are influenced at least by the Code of Practice aren’t they, and that says a lot about how they need to be done?

Oh gosh yes. I mean we did them like that before the Code of Practice… So we have a formal agenda for it, with the teacher’s report, the parents’ comments, any other agency’s comments. I can give you an agenda. The teacher has always done a pre-review report, and that’s always attached with the SEN 9 documentation, and any alterations to be made would be made at that point.

And are the reports circulated before the meeting takes place?

Yes

With parents as well?

Yes. We try to send the reports out two weeks before. It doesn’t always happen… Sometimes we have to bring reviews forward, sometimes we have to move the back, so… but we do try to, yes… And we also chase up the parents comments. Because you see, those don’t tend to come in. But the Local Authority is very keen to have the parents’ comments. And obviously the children’s report as well.

How are your processes designed to involve children and young people? I just observed the pupil filling in the review worksheet prior to the meeting that will take place this afternoon. So what other ways are the processes designed to involve the children and young people?

Well this [review worksheet] came directly out of the Code of Practice.

So is this used in all schools?

In Epton yes… Prior to the Code of Practice, really children weren’t involved in their reviews that much to be honest… It was very much professionals and adults.
But with the Code of Practice, this became a bone of contention really, and the Local Authority put together this proforma [review worksheet]. We started doing it ourselves with our own sort of... we had little smiley faces and things, to get the children to talk about how they are getting on. Then the authority came up with these proformas and that’s what we work with now.

**What do you think about these [review worksheet]?**

They're alright... I mean, we could probably do better, in a way... We could get children to talk about... we could do more work on getting the children to express their feelings... but it’s very hard for the children, and it’s how much time you’re going to spend on it... so this keeps it quite time efficient... And a lot of our children... it’s how much they can contribute to their review really, you know beyond that they are happy, and that they've learnt stuff and who has helped them.

**What does the level of involvement of children and young people in the annual statement review process depend on? Are there things that you will consider when planning on how much time you will spend...**

The things we consider are, their understanding and their emotional state, and the family circumstances. Because obviously for some children, if they are in a very pressured home situation, sometimes it’s actually quite difficult for them to come to the review and speak in the way that they might have spoken to us in a one to one situation. That doesn’t happen very often, but I am thinking of one particular child where he’s not that happy or relaxed to talk in that situation, in front of the parent... So you do need to talk their emotional state and their level of understanding into consideration.

**So you are being quite flexible...**

...And the parent's understanding... and the parents' response to the child as well.

**So you've got to consider those things for the child's sake...**
Appendix I – Range of ‘My Review’ worksheets in use at the resource based and special provisions
My targets for the next year are...

People who can help me with this are...

I can help myself by...

Is there anything you would like to change about your school?

Is there anything else you want us to know?

“Would you like to come to your review?” Yes! No!
What is a review?

It is a meeting to see how you have been doing in school over the last year and where plans are made about your future.

Why do I need to go to my review?

You need to go because how you feel about things is very important. It gives you the chance to tell everyone what you think and talk about your wishes and feelings.

What if I don’t want to go?

There are still lots of ways you can get involved in planning for your future.

You could:

E-mail your views, or ask your teacher to help you make a video. You could record your views on tape or write them down in a letter.
My name is: [Blank]

School: [Blank]

Date: 23/3/12
What do you like most about school?

Going into year 5

What do you think you have done best at this year?

Numeracy and controlling my Anger

Why do you think this has happened?

teachers and have listened
What do you find hard to do?

What help do you think you need?

Who has been helping you in school?
It is a meeting to see how you have been doing in school over the last year and where plans are made about your future.

You need to go because how you feel about things is very important. It gives you the chance to tell everyone what you think and talk about your wishes and feelings.

There are still lots of ways you can get involved in the planning for your future.

You could:
E-mail your views, or ask your teacher to help you make a video. You could record your views on tape or write them down in a letter.
Appendix J – Example of observation notes from preparatory meeting with Child A
(Case A)
Running Record Observation schedule

Context details: Meeting room @ school.

Identifier: Child A  Date: 23/3/12.

Activity: Preparation for ASR meeting.

Start time: 1:45  End time: 1:55  Duration: 10m.

Any additional information/notes:
TA explained A doesn't enjoy doing this as he dislikes literacy. A completed 'My Review' sheet, writing himself. TA read out most Q's, gave prompts to offer a range of responses he could pick from (Q1) or if she was thinking of something he hadn't come up with himself. TA shared that A's literacy difficulties result in angry outbursts.

Observations
TA encouraged A to give honest answers. Have sheet over to A to fill in name, school, date.
Prompted with date.
TA read out Q 1.
Additional "what gives you the extra value come in every day?"
A Nothing.
These must be something.
What about integration in Y 5? "Yes! A"
What about fun stuff?
If you had to pick a favourite subject, what would you pick? "Numeracy" A.

Thoughts
Adult initiated activity that A is required to engage with. Set Q's, and TA allowed for brief responses. Checked validity by going over at the end to ensure A happy with the response he'd given.
Observations

Q2. What do you think?
"You know what I'm going to put," A.
"Numeracy." A
"There's something I'd like you to put..."
"Yes, but what else do you..."
"My Anger." A -> TA gave agreement & promise for positive improvement.

Q3. Prompts - what else?
- What's helped?
- What have you done?

Q4. Right, is more, not much help.
Want you to be totally honest now, what do you find hard in class.

Literacy - I totally agree.
(Gave time for A to think.)

And topic

Q5. Used opportunity to demonstrate A's improvement, & cycle between anger, literacy, & asking for help.

Q6. A read this one out.
Came up with 1 teacher Mr.
Then 'all teachers.'
TA prompted - 'I know someone.'
Observations

'Mrs X' - Yes she helps you a lot doesn't she.

A asked for help with spelling.

Are you happy with everything that we've put on here?

→ Went through each one, read for A and be agreed with what she'd put.

A went back to class (was quick to get up & go).

TA allowed A time to think and write.

TA & A sat next to one another to complete the form.

TA & A knew one another well.

Thoughts

[Handwritten notes]

Shier

Level 2
openings & obligations (yes)
opportunities
→ a range?
rest reality
Appendix K – Example of interview guide used with CYP participants
Interview Guide – CYP

General
• Discussion with CYP about participation and what that might look like in school
  o When does CYP feel that they or other children (e.g. school council) participate in school?

Preparation for the ASR meeting
• Can you remember what the ASR meeting for yesterday? (What was its purpose?)
• When did you find out about the ASR meeting? Did you feel like you had enough time?
• Is it ok if we have a look over this sheet that you filled in with miss last week?
  o Have a look at documentation together
  o Do you like filling this in?
  o Are the questions easy or hard?
  o Are you glad that miss helped you? Could anyone else have helped you more?
  o How did you feel when you filled it in?
  o Why do you think that school want to know your answers to these questions?
  o Do you think that the answers to these questions are important for school to know?
  o Is it good to fill this in with the help of Mrs Y or could you do it by yourself or with somebody else?

Use my observations to prepare questions to find out:
How the CYP felt at various points during the ASR meeting
• How did you feel having your parent/carer there at the meeting?
• Would there be anyone else that you would have liked to have been there with you? Why would you like them to be there? How would it make you feel?
• Do you think that Mrs X and your parent/carer listened to the things you shared about what you like about your chosen high school?
• Do you think that your choice about where you go to High School is important?
• How did you feel about being in the meeting for the time you were there – Too long? Just right? Too short?

• Mrs X explained that the meeting was important and it was for talking about how you are getting on at school, and about high school. Do you think it is important that you were there?

• How does it make you feel that Mrs X asked you to be there at the meeting to tell everyone there how you think that you are getting on?

• Do you think it is important for Mrs X and your Mum to hear what you think about how you're getting on at school and your views on High School?

• How did you feel about your parent carer, Mrs X and Miss Y carrying on talking about how you are getting on when you weren't in the room?

• Do you feel like everyone at the meeting listened to what you had to say?

• Can you think of anything or anyone that helped you to take part in the meeting like you did yesterday? What did they do?

• What might help other CYP to participate in their meetings?

• Can you think of any other ways that the meeting could have been better?

**Use my observations to prepare questions to find out:**

Reflections on what happens after the ASR meeting

• Do you think that Mrs X, Miss Y and your parent/carer remember what you’ve said and it makes a difference to what happens at school?

• Do you value your opportunity to participate and have your say? Why?

• How does it make you feel now you have had your say in your meeting?

• What do you think will happen next now the meeting is finished?
Appendix L – Example of transcript from interview carried out with Child A (Case A)
I've come in to talk to you about something called participation. Have you heard that word before?

Yes

What do you think it is about?

It means when you take a place in a race, and you try to win but you don’t, and it’s participation.

You’re taking part. Yes, that is like participation, that’s right. Participation can mean lots of things, as well as a race. It basically means taking part, just like what you said. So now, it’s important for children to take part in lots of things in school. So can you think of times in school that you take part in things, or when you have a say, you have a voice? Do you ever hear that in school?

Well... I used to be part of the Eco Committee.

Oh did you?

Yes. And I used to go to lots of meetings.

That’s a perfect example of participation, well done A. You know what I mean don’t you when I say participation.

Mmm hmm [agreement].

So in the Eco Committee, did you get to make decisions and talk about things with other children?

Yes.
What sort of decisions did you make? Can you remember any?

Like, to help the environment decisions.

That sounds good. So you know exactly what I'm talking about now don’t you? Good. Ok, we're on the same page. So, can you remember that you were at a meeting yesterday and I was there? That was a meeting yesterday wasn’t it.

Yes.

There was you, your Nan, Mrs C, and your teacher.

Yes.

What's your teacher's name?

Mrs Z

Mrs Z. Ok. So we were all there, and I was just watching. So can you remember what that meeting was for?

[pause] Erm, no...

Did anyone tell you what it was for?

No.

I think when we got there, Miss said that it was for having a chat about how you were getting on at school...

Oh yeah.
And it was to have a little think about high school as well wasn’t it.

Yeah... yeah

**Ok. So when did you find out you were going to the meeting? Can you remember?**

Oh, I’ve known since last week. On Wednesday.

**Oh did you? And who told you?**

I think it was Mrs M.

**Was it? She’s your TA isn’t she?**

Yeah.

And so did you feel like you had enough time to get ready for the meeting?

Yes.

**Yeah, that was enough time?**

Mmm hmm [agreement].

Ok, so is it alright if we have a little look at the sheet you have filled in, when I saw you filling it in with Mrs M.

Sure.

**This is the third time we’ve looked at this now isn’t it! Because you filled it in, then you looked at it yesterday, now you’re looking at it again.**
[groan]

Ok so what do you think about this then?

It is fine.

Is it fine? ... Did you find it ok to fill in?

Oh yeah.

What do you think about the questions?

They're fine.

Are they hard to answer or easy?

No, easy.

And why do you think school wants to know the answers to these questions?
Why do you think school want to know about what you like about school?

Erm...

Why do you think they want to know what you think?

I don't know.

You don't know?... Let's have a think. Why might they want to know...
[pause]... What was the meeting about again... the meeting was to talk about how you're getting on wasn't it. So...

[interrupts] Oh to find out how I'm getting on in the school.
Appendix M – Example of audit trail
Audit trail

First the researcher highlighted initial codes in the data, coding them as ‘quote notations’, demonstrated by the first 25 codes of the transcript for SENCo A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Initial codes (quote notations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ok, so I just wanted to ask you some questions generally about the annual statement review process and how it works in your school first of all. I want to ask about the types of information that you gather before the annual statement review meeting and who you take it from? | 1. School arrange ASR meeting  
2. School invite others to attend the ASR meeting  
3. Range of relevant professionals are invited to attend the ASR meeting by school  
4. Information is gathered by school in report format from relevant professionals who cannot attend |
<p>| Oh right... [interruption] Well, depending on which professionals are involved with the child, we invite all the relevant professionals to the annual review, including the paediatricians who don’t usually come. But we then take reports off anyone who is involved with the child. We don’t usually have paediatrician reports but we have speech and language therapy reports, and if the educational psychologist has seen the child that year we’d have that report. Sometimes occupational therapy, sometimes if there’s |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Initial codes (quote notations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a social worker involved, if the child is looked after, they wouldn’t necessarily provide a report but they would attend the meeting. And we invite those people to attend the meeting. And usually... the norm would be that we’d have the speech and language therapist, the class teacher, the parent (the parents fill in a parents comments sheet beforehand), and if it’s a transition review or if there’s any controversy about provision then we invite the statementing officer from the local authority. | 5. Parents are usually present at ASR meeting  
6. Parents asked to provide their views in written format prior to ASR meeting  
7. LA attend the ASR review if there is ‘controversy’ about provision |
| Is the way you work the annual reviews at school quite flexible, or has it been done in a certain way for a while? And who developed the processes? | 8. SENCo developed ASR processes in school during 20 years in post  
9. Overall ASR process has been the same for a long time |
<p>| Well I suppose I developed the processes because I’ve been doing it for 20 years at this school. Well, I was mainstream and then I went to special needs about 15-16 years ago. So the processes have been like that for a long time. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Initial codes (quote notations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s the way our Local Authority Reviews are run.</td>
<td>10. School ASR processes are informed by LA guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past, it used to be that someone from the Local Authority would come to most reviews. Whereas now they only tend to come if there’s a controversy or if it’s a transition review.</td>
<td>11. ASR in school follow processes reflected in the LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So they are run in the same way around Epton would you say?</td>
<td>12. School takes main responsibility for straightforward ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would say so yes</td>
<td>13. School request attendance from LA at ASR when there is controversy or for the transition review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because they are influenced at least by the Code of Practice aren’t they, and that says a lot about how they need to be done?</td>
<td>14. No mention of CYP in development of ASR processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh gosh yes. I mean we did them like that before the Code of Practice...</td>
<td>15. School ASR processes are similar to other schools in LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So we have a formal agenda for it, with the teacher’s report, the parents’ comments.</td>
<td>16. School developed their processes prior to guidance and legislation in the Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. ASR meeting follows a formal agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. ASR meeting is lead by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Information is provided by teacher prior to ASR meeting in written format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>Initial codes (quote notations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any other agency's comments. I can give you an agenda. The teacher has always done a pre-review report, and that's always attached with the SEN 9 documentation, and any alterations to be made would be made at that point.</td>
<td>20. Teacher is given opportunity to share information in the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And are the reports circulated before the meeting takes place?</td>
<td>21. Parent is given opportunity to share information in the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22. Relevant agencies are given opportunity to share information in the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. No mention of CYP views in formal agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. School circulate information shared prior to meeting with relevant parties (including parents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next the researcher created initial subthemes for the codes/quote notations, as demonstrated in the following first 25 initial codes of the transcript for SENCo A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial codes (quote notations)</th>
<th>Initial subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School arrange ASR meeting</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School invite others to attend the ASR meeting</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Range of relevant professionals are invited to attend the ASR meeting by school</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information is gathered by school in report format from relevant professionals who cannot attend</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents are usually present at ASR meeting</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents asked to provide their views in written format prior to ASR meeting</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LA attend the ASR review if there is ‘controversy’ about provision</td>
<td>Role of LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SENCo developed ASR processes in school during 20 years in post</td>
<td>Development of ASR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School ASR processes are informed by LA guidance</td>
<td>Role of LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall ASR process has been the same for a long time</td>
<td>Development of ASR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial codes (quote notations)</td>
<td>Initial subthemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ASR in school follow processes reflected in the LA</td>
<td>Role of LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School takes main responsibility for straightforward ASRs</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. School request attendance from LA at ASR when there is controversy or for the transition review</td>
<td>Role of LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. No mention of CYP in development of ASR processes</td>
<td>Participation of CYP in the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. School ASR processes are similar to other schools in LA</td>
<td>ASR processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. School developed their processes prior to guidance and legislation in the Code of Practice</td>
<td>Development of ASR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ASR meeting follows a formal agenda</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ASR meeting is lead by school</td>
<td>Role of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Information is provided by teacher prior to ASR meeting in written format</td>
<td>Information shared prior to ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher is given opportunity to share information in the ASR meeting</td>
<td>Information shared during ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Parent is given opportunity to share information in the ASR meeting</td>
<td>Information shared during ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Relevant agencies are given opportunity to share information in</td>
<td>Information shared during ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial codes (quote notations) | Initial subthemes
---|---
the ASR meeting | Participation of CYP in the task
23. No mention of CYP views in formal agenda | Information shared prior to ASR meeting
24. School try to circulate information shared prior to meeting with relevant parties (including parents) | 

The initial subthemes ‘Information shared during ASR meeting’ and ‘Information shared prior to ASR meeting’ were refined as subtheme ‘Information sharing’, as identified in the table below, along with an example of another similarly refined initial subtheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial subtheme</th>
<th>Refined subtheme</th>
<th>Subsequent main theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information shared prior to ASR meeting</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Adult-directed ASR processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared during ASR meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of LA</td>
<td>LA and government</td>
<td>Influences on the participation of CYP in the ASR process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher grouped the initial codes/quote notations as demonstrated by the following photograph related to the subtheme ‘Information sharing’ (as shown on the right hand side of the photograph below), and identified an overarching main theme ‘Adult directed ASR processes’ (as shown at the top of the photograph below) whereby other subthemes were later relevant.

The researcher continued to refine subthemes and identify overarching main themes, and then refine their position in the thematic map.
The final thematic map as seen above and in fig. 4.1 was a result of this progressive refining process from the initial codes (quote notations) described at the beginning of this audit trail resulting in subthemes and main themes.
Appendix N – Content analysis: ‘My Review’ worksheet (Case A)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the 'My Review' worksheet</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>My Review worksheet</th>
<th>Pre-determined categories for coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Facilitated Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Supported to express views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted for CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Facilitated Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Supported to express views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted for CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Consulted with CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Facilitated Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Supported to express views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Listened to views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted for CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task – Assisted in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-determined categories for coding</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td>My Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Participation in the task – Adult initiated
- Participation in the task – CYP initiated
- Participation in the task – Assigned for CYP
- Facilitated with CYP
- Listened to the child - Voice of the child
- Supported to express views - Voice of the child
- Views taken into account
- Views to express
- Alternative ways to share
- Option of
- Information regarding the purpose of the ASR meeting and what to expect
- Options of a child

Views expressed and asking about the views regarding the task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-determined categories for coding</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>(\text{My Review Worksheet})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing progress and achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making – ASR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why CYP needs to attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of ASR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information regarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information regarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to share views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from the synthesised model of participation (fig. 2.1)
Appendix O – Content analysis: Observation of preparatory meeting with Child A (Case A)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-determined Categories for Coding</th>
<th>Child A to think and time for opportunity</th>
<th>TA gave document through the working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA led working to answer questions</td>
<td>TA support to lead questions, 'My Review', completing the worksheet, preparing the meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA support to read questions</td>
<td>TA support to consider answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA led working through the document</td>
<td>TA gave opportunity and time for Child A to think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Derived from the synthesised model of participation (fig. 2.1)*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Pre-determined categories for coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preschool meeting</td>
<td>Informed decision making – CYP initiated!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P – Content analysis: Observation of ASR meeting with Child A (Case A)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of meeting</th>
<th>Agenda (45 minutes)</th>
<th>Child A attended the ASR meeting for first 15 minutes (of 45 minutes)</th>
<th>Child A keen to talk and share views on High School and share views on CYP of the task initiated with CYP facilitated by child</th>
<th>Child A happy to engage in brief discussion and share views with &quot;My Review&quot; sheet.</th>
<th>Voice of the child—Listened to views expressed by the child. Support for the child.</th>
<th>Voice of the child—Listened to views expressed by the child. Support for the child.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derived from the synthesised model of participation (Fig. 2.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-determined Categories for Coding</td>
<td>ASR Meeting</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Listened to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Listened to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assigned for</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the task –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A wanted to &quot;make a speech&quot;</td>
<td>Child A made a request to be integrated for Spanish classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCo A and Nan</td>
<td>Acknowledged Child A's views re. high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan was happy to follow the child A's wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A's views re. mainstream placement to choose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A made a request to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan acknowledged Child A's wish for high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A made a request to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes**

Pre-determined categories for coding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASR meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-determined categories for coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A attended the ASR meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Derived from the synthesised model of participation (fig. 2.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Decision-making - ASR meeting</th>
<th>Decision-making - Involved</th>
<th>Decision-making - Involved</th>
<th>Decision-making - Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-determined categories for coding</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENCo A and Nan discuss high school placement. Nan acknowledges Child A’s views re. high school. Nan was happy to follow Child A’s choice. SENCo A and Nan discuss the purpose of having the ASR meeting early – to plan for making the right decision re. high school placement. SENCo A and Nan discuss Child A’s nature and personality whilst considering decisions to be made.
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