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**Abstract**

Ines Figueiredo Alves (The University of Manchester)  
Ph.D. in Education, October 2014  
Title: Responding to diversity, constructing difference: A comparative case-study of individual planning in schools in England and Portugal

This thesis is a comparative case-study of how teachers in England and Portugal conceptualise and respond to pupil diversity in the context of individual planning. The purpose is to compare the processes and underlying assumptions in the two countries, in order to understand the impact of cultural aspects and of system characteristics on the phenomenon of individual planning.

The research was conducted through a nested case-study approach in 10 schools in England and six schools in Portugal. The methods used were interviews with practitioners and analysis of individual planning documents. This study was done by following the cases of 41 pupils, who were identified by their teachers as ‘needing individual planning’, over a two-year period.

The most common form of individual planning mentioned in educational policy are Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for pupils with ‘Special Education Needs’ (e.g. UK SEN 2001 Code of Practice, Portuguese Law 3/2008). Despite the apparent similarities, what is meant by IEPs in educational policy varies significantly. In this study, a comparative analytical cultural-historical framework (Artiles & Dyson 2005) and a ‘societal approach’ (Hantrais & Mangen 2007) were useful theoretical resources to overcome these challenges. This thesis presents an original approach to individual planning by looking beyond ‘special needs’ and national boundaries.

The research identifies responses associated with individual planning and problematizes this practice as a solution to the challenges posed by student diversity to schools. This process is done with reference to the unstated assumptions about normality and difference proposed by Minow (1990).

The study concludes that teachers conceptualise and respond to pupil diversity through a formulaic problem-solving approach. This approach is based on limited repertoires that are underpinned by contextual factors such as educational policy. These repertoires are wider and more flexible in England than in Portugal.
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**Glossary**

**CEI** [Curriculo especifico individual] – ‘specific individual curriculum’, the most restrictive form of individual planning under the Portuguese special education legislation (DL 3/2008)

**Cycle** – similar to Key stages in England, the Portuguese educational system is organised into cycles, the 1\textsuperscript{st} cycle refers to years 1 to 4, when pupils are aged usually 6-10 years old, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cycle years 6 and 7, with pupils generally aged 10-12.

**DL** [Decreto-Lei] - decree-law

**DN** [Despacho Normativo] – order

**Education social benefits** [Ação Social Escolar] - implies economic support to buy books, pay for school dinners. It is similar to Free School Meal status in England in terms of being an indicator of lower socio-economic status

**Encarregado de educação** – equivalent to parent or carer in England, literal translation means ‘responsible for education’

**Follow up/ chaperone plans** [Planos de acompanhamento] – formal plans created by class teachers in Portugal for pupils who have been retained and are repeating a grade (Established through DN 50/2005)

**Head of Year** – most English secondary schools appoint a teacher for each year group with pastoral responsibility, to monitor the progress of all pupils, and to liaise with other schools (e.g. Head of Year 7 may liaise with the primary schools pupils come from before they start secondary school); the equivalent of this role in Portugal is the:
[Diretor de turma] – head of ‘class’, in Portuguese secondary schools one of the subject teachers is appointed to be ‘responsible’ for each class and coordinate the meetings and communication between the class teachers and teacher-parents.

**IBP** – individual behaviour plan

**ICF** - International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health, it is a framework for measuring health and disability published by the World Health Organisation (WHO 2001). It is divided into four main sections: body structures (b), body functions (s), activities and participation (d) and environmental factors (e). There is also a children and youth version usually referred to as ICF-CY (WHO 2007b)

**IEP** – Individual Education Plan

**KS or Key stage** – schooling in England is organised into key stages, KS1 refers to years 1 and 2, when pupils are 5 to 7 years old; KS2 years 3 to 6, with pupils aged 7-11. These key stages are linked to the National Curriculum

**Recovery/ catch up plans** [Planos de recuperacao] – formal plans created by class teachers in Portugal for pupils with difficulties in learning (Established through DN 50/2005)

**SA, SA+ or SAP** – School action and School action plus

**SALT** – Speech and Language Therapy

**SEN** – Special Educational Needs

**SENCO** – Special education needs coordinator, a teacher who is responsible for coordinating the school’s responses to pupils with SEN, namely by
supporting teachers, planning interventions and liaising with external agencies that support pupils with SEN

**SPLD** - Specific Learning Difficulties

**TA** – Teaching assistant or Learning support assistant refers to school staff who works to support teachers and pupils (usually pupils ‘with SEN’) in or outside the classroom.

**WHO** – World Health Organisation
Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis is concerned with responding to pupil diversity through individual planning in England and Portugal. It presents empirical evidence of a cross-national case study that aimed to explore the mechanisms of conceptualising and managing difference in mainstream schools and to compare processes and underlying assumptions held by teachers in the two countries. Despite individual educational planning being commonly associated with the field of ‘special educational needs’, in this study it is considered in general. So, individual planning is defined as a school response to pupil diversity that implies that some pupils are perceived as ‘needing’ something different from or additional to what is planned for most.

In this chapter, I start by explaining my interest in pupils who are disadvantaged and in notions of diversity and difference. I present a poem by António Gedeão, who was a renowned Portuguese poet and professor of Physics, Chemistry and History of Science. The poem describes how ‘there are no two leaves exactly alike’. Then, I present the focus of the study and explain the reasons for researching individual planning, comparatively, in Portugal and England. Thirdly, I present the broader context by locating this study in the field of schools’ responses to pupil diversity. Finally, I outline the structure of the thesis.

1.1 About me

I have trained to be a primary (Years 1-4) and Portuguese and French (Year 5-9) teacher in Portugal (2000-2004). Since my first contact with pupils in a classroom as a young and inexperienced training teacher, I was fascinated by the pupil diversity that then started to be evident in schools in Lisbon.
Additionally, I was puzzled by how teachers could respond to pupils who were so different, within the same classroom. The University pedagogy modules had taught me to analyse, be critical and select which pages of the textbooks to use, and also that we could create different activities from those traditionally presented. The educational psychology modules had taught me about different intelligences and learning styles, but all of that seem to be only applicable for the development of exceptional activities and not for everyday teaching. So how would I deal with pupils who did not seem motivated to learn? How would I respond to pupils who had been retained and were working on a different curriculum from their peers? What would I do when my students would arrive from another country with little or no Portuguese? Moreover, what would I do about pupils with disabilities?

I chose to present a poem by Gedeão because it strongly resonates with my thinking. Similarly to ‘the leaves’ we are all different and unique, even when we look the same or when only some of our differences are noticed. In the school context, despite all pupils being different from one another, there seem to be various ‘types of difference’. Moreover, only some pupils are perceived as ‘different’ to the extent of needing individual planning.

My fascination by the schools’ ‘minorities’ compelled me to do an MA in Language, Ethnicity and Education at King’s College London (2004-2005), and an MA in Special Education (Inclusion and Disability Studies) at the Institute of Education, London (2005-2007).

In fact, as long as I can remember I have always wanted to ‘be different’, almost as if ‘being normal’ was the worst insult that could be thrown at me. A later experience working for an organisation of people with disabilities (2007-2010) made me experience (by proxy) what it was to be different without choice, to experience barriers to participation in daily life, and to
‘just want to be able to do things other people did and be treated the way other people were’. That is to say that, there are various ‘sides’ of difference. Some of these depend on individual choice, but many are beyond the control of those considered to be ‘different’. 
Não há, não, duas folhas iguais em toda a criação.

Ou nervura a menos, ou célula a mais, não há, de certeza, duas folhas iguais.

Limbo todas têm, que é próprio das folhas; pecíolo algumas; bainha nem todas.

Umas são fendidas, crenadas, lobadas, inteiras, partidas, singelas, dobradas.

Outras acerosas, redondas, agudas, macias, viscosas, fibrosas, carnudas.

Nas formas presentes, nos actos distantes, mesmo semelhantes são sempre diferentes.

Umas vão e caem no charco cinzento, e lançam apelos nas ondas que fazem; outras vão e jazem sem mais movimento.

Mas outras não jazem, nem caem, nem gritam, apenas volitam nas dobras do vento.

É dessas que eu sou.

**António Gedeão**

No, there aren’t, two leaves alike in the whole world.

Either a rib less, or an extra cell, there aren’t for sure two leaves alike.

Lamina they all have which is a feature of leaves; some petiole; stipules not all.

Some are serrate, crenate, lobed entire, parted, single, doubled.

Other needle-like, rounded, spiky, smooth, sticky, fibrous, fleshy.

In the present forms, In the distant acts, even similar they are always different.

Some go and fall in the grey pond, and cry in the waves they make; others go and lie without further movement.

But others do not lie, neither fall, nor scream, they only fly as the wind blows.

That’s the kind I am.

(My translation)
1.2 Focus of the study

The reason for choosing to focus on individual planning for my Ph.D. research came from a mixture of curiosity and almost scepticism. While working as a Marie Curie early stage researcher in an European project (MURINET – Multidisciplinary Research Network on Health and disability) I had the chance to come into contact with other national contexts by attending workshops and meetings in other countries (Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands); and by collaborating with researchers from other countries (Italy, Scotland, Germany, Sweden, U.S.A., Russia, Poland, and Egypt). Although the focus of the project was on health, disability and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)(WHO 2001), education was at the heart of many debates. Even more so when focusing on the use of the ICF in education (Maxwell et al. 2012; Moretti et al. 2012).

The analysis and discussion of national policy from Italy, England, France, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the U.S.A. highlighted Individual Education Plans (IEPs) – a common point between the countries’ educational systems when responding to pupils with disabilities or ‘special educational needs’. The reason for my curiosity was how IEPs were portrayed as ‘a solution to all challenges’ created by pupil diversity. The presentation of IEPs as a simple, neat solution resonated with Menken (1917, p.xiv) ‘There is always a well-known solution to every human problem — neat, plausible, and wrong’. Initially my aim was to explore the development and use of IEPs.

However, a review of the academic literature made me realise that there was already a considerable amount of work done regarding ‘the IEP process’ and the positive impact of involving pupils and parents in making decisions (e.g.
Fish 2008; Kane et al. 2003; Goepel 2009; Pawley & Tennant 2008; Barnard-Brak & Lechtenberger 2009; Waite et al. 2009). I also understood the variability of what was implied by ‘IEP’. For example how the American Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a requirement of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and each public school must create an IEP for every pupil who receives special education and related services (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). Whereas in England this role was until recently played by a Statement of Special Educational Needs and schools used other forms of individual planning alongside IEPs such as individual behaviour plans (IBP).

As a result, I started conceptualizing an IEP as a ‘boundary object’ (Wenger 1998), something shared by several different ‘communities of practice’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991) but viewed or used differently by each of these communities. A systematic literature review on IEPs, revealed that much of what was written were ‘how to guides’ for teachers, advocates and parents and so there were few publications exploring the limitations of the use of IEPs or more broadly individual planning as a response to pupil diversity.

In this way, the study was reframed; I wanted to know more about the phenomenon of individual planning for some pupils. In other words, about the role of individual planning in schools, and why some pupils were perceived by their teachers as needing individual planning and provision. All things considered, the aims of the study are:

- to understand the mechanisms of conceptualisation of difference in education, through the perceived need for individual planning and provision for some students; and
- to compare the processes and underlying assumptions in schools in England and Portugal, in order to understand the impact of cultural aspects and system characteristics.

The research questions through which these aims are to be pursued are:

1. Who is identified as needing individual planning?
2. What forms of individual planning are used in different contexts?
3. What interventions and provisions do these plans propose?

These three applied research questions were linked to empirical objectives of the study and they were complemented by a more theoretical underlying question: ‘What assumptions about normality and difference do these processes of individual planning imply?’.

The choice to do a comparative study was linked to the attempt to explore contextual factors. Indeed, by collecting data and comparing practices in two different educational systems it would help me create ‘interruptions that help to make the familiar unfamiliar’ (Ainscow 2005, p.12). In other words, by looking at data from two countries I would be better prepared to question the practices in each country and, to take a ‘critical stance’ towards my ‘taken-for-granted’ ways of understanding the world (Burr 2003). I wanted to explore the relationship between a plurality of causal macro and micro factors that influenced the individual planning phenomenon. I would look at similarities and differences between practices and I would try to explain them using a societal cross-national comparative approach (Hantrais & Mangen 2007). The case-study design would allow me to investigate the phenomenon of individual planning in-depth, in its real-life context (Yin 2003).
The choice of the two countries was based on two main reasons. The first was a practical reason, I had sufficient knowledge of both languages and countries to be able to conduct the interviews and analyse the data taking into account the subtle nuances in the way sensitive issues such as disability and difference are discussed. I had also worked as a teacher in schools in Portugal and as a teaching assistant in England. Therefore I had some previous knowledge about the way schools work, and the ways to access and manage participants.

The second reason had to do with the characteristics of the two countries, or rather of the two educational systems. Both England and Portugal have a system where there are a number of policies at national level, in particular a national curriculum and a framework for schools to respond to pupils with disabilities. In both countries state schools play a considerable role in implementing compulsory schooling. However, there are considerable differences which make the comparison interesting. For example, in Portugal all pupils are expected to attend their local school and the educational system is based on a one-track approach in terms of responses to pupils with SEN, so mainstream schools should be prepared to respond to pupils with disabilities (EADSNE 2003). By contrast, in England parental choice plays a key role in selecting which school pupils attend. Additionally, there is a multi-track approach (EADSNE 2003) to provision for pupils with SEND, which involves a continuum of responses from special schools to mainstream schools with inclusive practices. Moreover, grade retention is common in Portugal, and so are teacher-centred pedagogies in which textbooks play a predominant role, both in terms of planning and delivering lessons. Additionally, the notion of ‘class’ is extremely strong. Whereas in England, pupils move up by age and there are commons practices of differentiation, individual targets, and grouping pupils according to their perceived ability.
Furthermore, in Portugal the only real systemic division is between students ‘with SEN’ and those ‘without’, and there is extremely low permeability. Once a pupil is considered to have SEN it will be extremely hard for him/her to move out of that ‘category’ (apart from policy changes, usually based on financial, non-educational reasons). Therefore, the Portuguese educational system is characterised by few hierarchical tracks, but also by a low permeability between tracks. England, on the other hand has considerable permeability when compared to Portugal, but it has hierarchical tracks.

Finally, in England teaching assistants play a key role in responding to pupil diversity while in Portugal special education teachers or ‘regular’ teachers are responsible for providing what is ‘additional to’, or ‘different from’ what is available to the majority of pupils.

Even though individual planning is often associated with special educational needs and disabilities, my focus is on schools’ responses to pupil diversity in general. In this thesis I aim to understand which pupils are identified as ‘needing’ individual planning, how they are conceptualised, and responded to. The issue of diversity in education is extremely complex given the characteristics of the education systems in Portugal and England.

1.3 Broader context

The focus of this study is on individual planning and its impact on the conceptualisation of and responses to pupil diversity. The phenomenon of individual planning can be situated in a number of academic fields. Firstly, it is related to the literature on ‘special needs’ education since many of the pupils with individual planning have been identified by schools as having special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities. This is especially the case if we refer to one specific type of individual planning – ‘IEPs’ (Individual Education Plans).
IEPs are claimed to be 'ubiquitous, virtually every country’s special education provisions containing them as a key element to its provisions for students with special educational needs' (Mitchell, D., Morton, M., & Hornby, G., 2010, p.9). They have been introduced as a way to manage the schooling of pupils with disabilities in the United States in 1975 and have since then been adopted by many educational systems in many countries (Mitchell et al. 2010; Tennant 2007; Millward et al. 2002). Despite the different uses and status of IEPs, they are referred to in the literature as a common entity, with its benefits and disadvantages. The main advantages presented in the literature are associated with the IEP as a process, and its potential to involve various stakeholders, namely parents and pupils, in the collaborative definition of priorities and educational aims. Conversely, the IEP as a document has been analysed in the literature in a less positive light, being associated with a managerial paperwork with little educational benefits, and with a mechanistic view of teaching and learning based on a behaviourist approach. The accumulation of a variety of roles such managing, planning, monitoring, assessing, being accountable, seeking resources, deciding placement, and involving parents and pupils have been identified as problematic (Andreasson et al. 2013; Shaddock 2010).

In reality, IEPs are one type of individual planning and, there are others like Individual Behaviour Plans and Literacy Plans. Moreover, individual planning is one type of response to pupil diversity; there are other such as differentiation and personalisation. Furthermore, individual planning is usually associated with one ‘type’ of diversity, which can be described as ‘special needs’ and/ or disability. There are however, other aspects of diversity which the literature in the field of inclusion and inclusive education explores.
In terms of pupil diversity and target population, the literature on inclusion can be divided into two trends; one refers to the participation of pupils with disabilities and SEN in mainstream schools, whereas the other concerns the participation of all pupils, who may be disadvantaged in a school context for a variety of reasons. The approach to individual planning in this thesis aligns with the latter, which has been called the ‘inclusionary approach’ to inclusion (Thomas & Loxley 2007). There are various aspects of diversity that may cause disadvantage such as language, cultural and socio-economic background, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and disability (Ainscow et al. 2007; Minow et al. 2008; Moltó et al. 2010). In this study, these aspects of diversity are taken into account when exploring what factors generate in the teachers and school the perceived need to plan individually for some pupils. This process of conceptualising some students as needing something different from or additional to what is offered to the majority is at the centre of the analysis. I argue that the conceptualisations of pupil diversity are socially constructed and that they are influenced by underlying assumptions about difference (Minow 1990) and by contextual factors such as educational policy and teacher characteristics.

1.4 Structure of the thesis

The thesis consists of eight chapters.

Chapter two presents a review of the literature organised in two sections, the first regards conceptualisations of diversity, specifically referring to the target groups of individual planning and to the influence if wider notions of diversity. And the second around the issues of responding to pupil diversity, namely by defining ‘individual planning’ and contextualising its use.

Chapter three introduces the context firstly of the English and secondly the Portuguese educational systems. The contextual information includes the
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general education system, the approach to special and inclusive education and the cultural and historical aspects that influence thinking and procedures around individual planning.

Chapter four introduces the methodology of the study, including the research design, the methods for data collection; it discusses my role as a researcher, the ethical considerations, the rationale behind the sample selection, and methods for data analysis. Finally, it considers the impact of the pilot study in the development of the study.

Chapter five presents the analysis of the data collected in the eight English schools and is divided in two parts. The first presents the data from the angle of the pupils as a unit of analysis, providing four case vignettes and a presentation of themes that run across all the pupils’ cases and illustrates how difference was conceptualised in regards to individual planning. The second section uses the school as a unit of analysis and provides a school vignette to illustrate the data collected, and the themes found in the analysis of the data from all the English schools. Chapter six presents the analysis of the data collected in the six Portuguese schools and is structured in a similar way to Chapter five.

Chapter seven examines what is presented in Chapters five and six by looking across the two countries and putting forward the main similarities and differences in the way schools and teachers conceptualise and respond to pupils who are perceived as needing individual planning. It also explains the similarities and differences, namely by answering the first research question ‘Who is identified as needing individual planning?’ through a theoretical model that represents how the processes of conceptualisation and management of educational difference interact resulting in the construction of ‘difference’.
Chapter eight discusses the outcomes of the study and relates them to what has been written in the literature. This chapter starts by answering the research questions and discussing in depth four themes found in the data related to the assumptions about diversity and difference. Additionally, it presents my contribution to knowledge, the implications for policy and practice, as well as an evaluation of the study and suggestions for further research.
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A central aspect of this study is to understand the use and impact of individual planning when responding to pupil diversity. IEPs are an extremely common form of individual planning for a specific group of pupils, those described by teachers and schools as having special educational needs. However, IEPs are one type of document which is part of the phenomenon of individual planning witnessed in schools as part of their attempt to respond to pupils perceived as ‘being different’ and needing something additional to or different from what is provided to the majority of pupils.

The first part of the chapter concentrates on literature about conceptualisations of diversity in schools. To discuss the conceptualisation of diversity and difference, I will broaden my viewpoint to draw on perspectives not only from educational studies but also from other disciplinary standpoints such as sociology, law, and disability studies. These wider perspectives will provide me with conceptual tools to analyse my data. The body of literature analysed was gathered through searches using combinations of the keywords: ‘difference’, ‘diversity’, ‘conceptual*’, and ‘construction’. These searches were made on The University of Manchester Library search engine, and Google Scholar. The aim of this search was to gather theoretical information on how these concepts are used in the literature in the social sciences.

The second part of the chapter provides an overview of the responses to pupil diversity in a school context, it presents a review of the literature with a view to defining individual planning, including, but not limited to IEPs. It
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will critically analyse the existing body of literature on IEPs and contextualise the use of individual planning in education. It will do this by referring to a continuum of approaches to pupil diversity. This continuum ranges from structural and bureaucratic responses associated with special education; to adhocratic (Skrtic 1991b; Skrtic 2005) and inclusive practices within mainstream schools. This section is built with literature gathered through a systematic literature search on IEPs done in the first year of the PhD and several manual searches made during the duration of the study. The initial search was done on British Educational Index, Australian Educational Index, ERIC, and PsycINFO using the search term IEP as a keyword. The language was restricted to publications in English and there were no year limits. The reason for not selecting a specific time frame in the first search aimed to situate the appearance and the usage of IEP throughout the years. The later searches were made on The University of Manchester Library search engine, Google Scholar, and specific journals such as the European Journal of Special Needs and the Comparative Education. Searches used keywords such as ‘individual* plan*’, ‘personal* plan*’, and ‘different*’. Similar searches were performed using equivalent Portuguese keywords on Google, Google Scholar and in Portuguese Universities’ databases (e.g. Universidade do Minho, Universidade do Porto).

Throughout this chapter I will use literature from various countries as it has informed my thinking and the way I view the field of responding to pupil diversity, while doing so, I will bear in mind that even if some of these lines of thought have strongly influenced the wider academic and educational community they were a product of a contextual social and historical ethos. So, for example, there is a strong body of literature on special educational needs and inclusion that originates from England. Documents such as the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) and the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow,
2000) have been echoed in many countries through the use of the concepts of ‘special educational needs’ and ‘inclusive schools’ respectively. Another example is the concept of individual education plans (IEPs), now used in numerous education systems, which has its roots in the United States of America ‘Education for All Handicapped Children Act’ of 1975. Hence, there is a considerable spread of literature on IEPs and special education coming from the USA which reflects the particular situation and historic evolution in that context. The search revealed this preponderance of US literature in the field, and the bias is inevitably reflected in this review. However, the approach to individual planning present in the American literature is context-specific and reflects the existing policy around IEPs. This perspective differs from the cross-national comparative approach to individual planning used in this thesis. For this reason, I made efforts to ensure non-US literature was included, for example by hand searching the European Journal of Special Needs Education and referring to the work of Portuguese and UK-based scholars.

An important consideration at this point is the impact of non-academic literature in the field of responding to pupil diversity through individual planning. So, for example, two of the documents previously mentioned, the Warnock Report is a report of an enquiry into the education of ‘handicapped children and young people’ commissioned by the UK government and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act is a Public Law in the United States (PL 94-142). But this is also the case of publications by international bodies such as the UNESCO’s ‘Salamanca Statement’ (1994) and the OECD’s ‘Personalising Education’ (2006).
2.1 Conceptualising diversity

Difference and identity are constructed in and through social relations. Whether difference is seen positively, as diversity, or negatively as deviance or deficit depends on the mindset of the person or group of people who observe that difference (Thomas & Loxley 2007, p.93)

2.1.1 Individual planning, target groups and diversity in education

The target population of individual planning

There are certain groups which are traditionally identified as having ‘different needs’ that call for individual planning. IEPs are assumed to be targeted at population of pupils ‘with SEN’ and disabilities. Other types of individualisation such as differentiation refer to ‘all’ pupils and the notion of ability. Personalisation also mentions all pupils, and in some cases it refers specifically to ‘SEN’ or ‘gifted and talented’ pupils. In the following section, I review the literature with a view to exploring how are certain groups of pupils portrayed as the target groups of inclusion, special education and individual planning.

The notion of ‘SEN’ was brought into use in England in 1981 following the Warnock Report (Department for Education and Science 1978) as a statutory category of handicap to ‘avoid categories of disability into which children could be slotted and in which they would possibly remain indefinitely’, it also aimed to encourage teachers ‘to concentrate on what they [children] needed in order to make progress’ and to ‘emphasise the seamless continuum of abilities and needs’ (Warnock & Norwich 2010). Warnock defines children who have special needs as ‘children who for various reasons have difficulties in learning at school’ (2010). However, ‘definitions of SEN
varies widely across countries as they are specific to each country’s legislation’ (OECD 2012a). Some countries define SEN as a synonym of disability and/or impairment whereas others use a wider definition closer to what was initially intended. For example OECD’s definition states that:

A child is commonly recognised as having special educational needs if he or she is not able to benefit from the school education made generally available for children of the same age without additional support or adaptations in the content of studies’ (OECD 2012a).

This definition introduces the concept of ‘additional needs’ or ‘additional support needs’, which is used as an alternative to SEN and tends to focus on ‘needs’ regardless of the reasons behind them. It is used in the Scottish Education Act 2004:

A child or young person has additional support needs for the purposes of this Act where, for whatever reason, the child or young person is, or is likely to be, unable without the provision of additional support to benefit from school education provided or to be provided for the child or young person. (Scottish Parliament 2004)

So, two main ways of conceptualising the group of students who are perceived as needing individual planning are ‘pupils with SEN’ and ‘pupils with additional needs’. However, the literature refers to many aspects of diversity which may have an impact on the way pupils learn. Florian (2012) outlines how

‘many countries now use the term inclusion to refer to a much broader range of learners who are vulnerable to the forces of educational and social exclusion than is permitted by the term special educational needs. It reflects a view of special education as an artifact of a country’s schooling structures, teaching approaches, and systems of assessment, acknowledging that whether students are in need of special education support depends on the extent to which school organisational structures
and staff are sufficiently flexible in adapting the curriculum and teaching strategies.’ (Florian 2012, pp.275–6)

Other conceptualisations of pupil diversity

‘Inclusive education has become a global movement that emerged as a response to educational equity concerns regarding students viewed as different by educational systems’ (Kozleski & Waitoller 2010, p.655)

Some pupils are regarded as ‘different’ by educational systems. Broad categories of SEN and additional support needs are often used in policy documents to try and avoid categorical labels. These labels have been reported to contribute to lowered teacher expectations, discrimination, and views of difference as ‘deviation from normal’ (Florian & McLaughlin 2008a, p.5). Teachers’ perspectives on difference and expectations impact on their practice with children (See for example Robinson & Diaz 2005; Hayes & Deyhle 2000; Mitchell et al. 2010). Specifically in the field of special education it has been reported that the beliefs about the conceptualisation of disability have a deep influence on how much teachers believe they can have an impact on their pupils’ learning (Hollenweger 2011a; Hollenweger 2011b).

Views of disability as a consequence of socially constructed barriers make teachers believe they have the capacity to change than if they see it as something intrinsic to the pupil, structural, and organic. This section reviews the literature to explore what aspects of diversity are mentioned in educational research. This is relevant to provide theoretical information that will serve as the basis for address my first research ‘Who is identified as needing individual planning?’.

Schools have witnessed changes in the student population in the sense of an increase in student diversity, which can be associated with a ‘radical change in the social universe’ in which schools are based (Roldão 1999). There has been a change in the demographics, and in cultural, legal, economic, and
societal factors (Moltó et al. 2010; Dyson & Millward 2000; Florian & McLaughlin 2008b; Skrtic 2005; Roldão 1999). Sliwka (2010) proposes that schools develop through a paradigm shift from homogeneity to heterogeneity and to diversity. Schools of homogeneity do not acknowledge difference and assume that pupils are similar. Schools of heterogeneity see difference as a challenge and make adjustments to respond to pupils’ ‘different needs’. Finally, schools of diversity see difference as an asset and opportunity and use pupils’ differences as a resource for learning and development (Sliwka 2010, p.214).

Table 1 presents a summary of various aspects of diversity and groups referred to in the literature. These can be divided into students’ characteristics and contextual factors but in fact most aspects result from the interaction between personal and contextual factors.
## Authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Groups/ aspects of diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ainscow 2011)</td>
<td>'Exceptional students'; new to a class; children from different cultural backgrounds; and those with disabilities; 'special educational needs'; groups who suffer discrimination in society, minority backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainscow &amp; Miles (2008)</td>
<td>Disability, SEN, 'bad behaviour', vulnerable to exclusion, social class, vulnerable and marginalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartolo et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Language and cultural diversity, gender, personality and readiness levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspects of difference in pupils:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contextual factors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.Cultural background (family and home background, gender, ethnicity, subcultures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.Classroom context (newcomers, good and bad days of individual pupils, and whole-class characteristics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student's individual characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality, character, level of maturity, motivation and interests, behaviour, learning patterns and multiple intelligences and special educational needs; readiness in physical, language development and reading, and levels of ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth (2003, p.258)</td>
<td>Groups of learners who may experience barriers to learning and participation: Learners in poverty, affected by war, environmental degradation and change, learners victims of abuse and violence, street children, children brought up by the state, children labourers, disabled learners, girls, learners affected by HIV and AIDS, learners whose home language is different from the language of instruction, nomadic learners, learners from oppressed minorities, those who have inadequate schools and inappropriate curricula and teaching, learners who are pregnant and have young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Context/Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson and Millward (2000)</td>
<td>In the context of the Salamanca statement - marginalised groups: Street children, working children, children from ethnic minorities, children from remote areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florian (2012, p.275)</td>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minow et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Race, gender, disability, religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moltó et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Culture, language, socioeconomic status/social class, religion, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, disability and special talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich (2008a)</td>
<td>Areas of 'vulnerability': SEND, social exclusion, socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, ethnic minorities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD (2005)</td>
<td>- Disabilities: Students with disabilities or impairments viewed in medical terms as organic disorders attributable to organic pathologies (e.g. in relation to sensory, motor or neurological defects). The educational need is considered to arise primarily from problems attributable to these disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Difficulties: Students with behavioural or emotional disorders, or specific difficulties in learning. The educational need is considered to arise primarily from problems in the interaction between the student and the educational context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Disadvantages: Students with disadvantages arising primarily from socio-economic, cultural, and/or linguistic factors. The educational need is to compensate for the disadvantages attributable to these factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Loxley (2007)</td>
<td>Factors that contribute to children’s difficulties at school: Disability, language, family income, cultural or ethnic origin, and gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 summarises some of the approaches presented in the literature. The tripartite model proposed by the OECD has limitations as it fails to capture
the complexity of the children’s characteristics and how they are interpreted in different countries (Florian et al. 2006). The complexity of the notion of diversity, the existence of many factors which have a bearing on how pupils ‘perform’ in school and the overlap of many of these factors in ‘one’ individual pupil, seems evident.

Diversity in education is often portrayed as a value (Humphrey et al. 2006; Roldão 2003). Moreover, a respect for diversity is often associated with human rights. In reality, pupil diversity poses challenges to schools that were developed with a more homogeneous population in mind as I discussed in section 2.3 (Contextualising individual planning).

2.1.2 The influence of wider notions of diversity and difference

The term ‘diversity’ can refer to:
- race/ethnicity
- social class
- gender
- sexuality
- cultural or
- disability/ impairment
- religion
- language (Weber 1998; Ore 2003; Rosenblum & Travis 2008; Minow et al. 2008; Robinson & Diaz 2005)

Markus (2008) elaborates on the existence of two types of differences: culturally derived differences which are often called cultural or ethnic differences. And historically imposed status differences, often called racial differences (Minow et al. 2008, p.65). Researchers and disciplines dedicate their attention to different aspects of diversity. What these authors have in
common is a sense that the notion of difference is contextual. It is constructed through social interaction through an ‘active process of definition and redefinition’ (Clarke & Cochrane 1998). The notion of social construction should not be confused with the social model of disability as it does not imply that differences in individuals do not exist.

The models of disability are a relevant example of different conceptualisations of an aspect of difference. The medical model of disability views disability ‘as a problem of the person, directly caused by disease, trauma or other health condition, which requires medical care provided in the form of individual treatment by professionals’ (WHO, 2001). On the contrary, the social model of disability (c.f. Oliver 1990; Barnes 1998) considers disabilities to be socially created problems experienced by individuals with physical, sensory, intellectual, or psychological impairments. This model has been criticised for ignoring the effects of impairments in the lives of persons with disabilities (Fougeyrollas & Beauregard 2001; Shakespeare 2006). The ICF biopsychosocial approach (WHO 2001) tries to harmonise the strengths of the medical and the social models by emphasising the interaction between individual and environmental factors. This approach uses the useful notions of facilitators and barriers when describing environmental factors however has been criticised for maintaining an ‘individual perspective’ (D’Alessio 2008). The ICF is also interesting because it is being used in some countries in the processes of assessment of pupils’ needs (Moretti et al. 2012). Finally, the human-rights based approach presents ‘a change in discourse from needs to rights’ (Alves, 2012). This is relevant when studying responses to pupil diversity as it is based on the principle of 'full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others’ (United Nations 2007).
The notion of social construction however does not imply the lack of existence of differences. For example Minow (1990) makes it clear that ‘real differences’ do exist, however she alerts us for the fact that we attribute particular significance to certain traits and assign labels of difference unthinkingly. Minow discusses how children from a very young age are taught and expected to ‘pick out items that do not belong with the rest of the group’. She explains how when we analyse, we simplify and sort by breaking complicated perceptions into discrete traits (Minow 1990, p.3). While this may seem an innocuous exercise, it encourages people to distinguish, to divide the world, to discriminate. She gives the example of a chair, a table, a cat and a bed, in which the cat would be excluded as it is an animal and all the other items are furniture; and reminds us that while doing this we would be ignoring other characteristics such as the fact that they may all have four legs. I would even add that maybe the chair, if it was an office chair, could have only one leg.

The categories that we use to describe ourselves and those around us are another example of ‘social construction’. For instance, people with mixed racial heritage can describe themselves as ‘multiracial’ in the US Census since the year 2000, before had to describe themselves using the existing categories (white, black, ...) (Ore 2003). That is to say that when conceptualising diversity people often have to fit themselves into pre-existing socially constructed labels, which do not always encompass the complex reality. Furthermore, Ore argues that differences are not in themselves negative or causes of inequality, if anything they make societies more interesting. The meanings and values applied to these differences make them harmful. The issue is not that whites and black are different, it is that whites are considered superior. She argues that categories of difference are constructed and then transformed into systems of inequality (Ore 2003, p.2).
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In some cases difference seems to have a negative connotation when compared to the concept of diversity. There are underlying assumptions about who is considered different, while it seems to be ‘easy, common and politically uncontroversial to ‘celebrate diversity’ (Eriksen 2006). The literature does not fully reflect how ‘there is considerable support for cultural diversity in the public sphere, while difference is increasingly seen as a main cause of social problems associated with immigrants and their descendants’ (Eriksen 2006).

Some authors try to dismiss the issues linked to difference, for example Cigman questions ‘Who is different from whom? To what extent should we conceptualise difference? To what extent should we treat everyone as the same? Is it demeaning to be identified as different from the norm?’ (Cigman 2007, p.783). The post-positivist paradigms refute that differences between learners are objectively ‘real’, and context that ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ pupils exist. However, this contrasts with Minow (Minow 1990; Minow et al. 2008). Minow explains that differences between learners do exist. The issue is that particular attention and importance is given to certain differences; and that when perceived, difference raises questions and creates dilemmas of difference. She proposed that ‘to be different is to be different in relationship to someone or something else’ s (Minow 1990, p.50) but that the ‘point of comparison is often unstated’ (Minow 1990, p.23). She describes how this comparative notion is based on five assumptions, that:

1. Difference is intrinsic not a comparison

2. The norm does not need to be stated (majority or perspective of those who have greater access to power)

3. The observer is neutral and can see without a perspective
4. Other perspectives, namely the opinions of those being judged, are irrelevant.

5. The status quo is natural, uncoerced and good (Minow 1990, pp.51–52)

It is difficult to think critically; and to recognise that our own standpoint and enculturation influences what we perceive as "normal" or "ordinary" (author's inverted commas) (Ore 2003, p.3). By enculturation Ore means the immersion in our own culture to the point that we assume that our way of life is "natural". She suggests that cultural relativism is the way forward. That means that a culture should be judged by its own cultural rules and values; and that we need to examine the assumptions that form the basis of our ideas and ways of behaving (Ore 2003, p.4).

Weber (1998) argues that race, class, gender, and sexuality are socially constructed as opposed to being biologically determined. She proposes that they should be conceptualised in a contextual way. And even though they persist throughout history they are never static/ fixed (1998, p.16), they are defined by the dominant culture and viewed as linked to biology (1998 p.18). They are based in a system of power relationships at a structural (macro) and psychological (micro) social level (1998, pp.20–21).

Difference is a fascinating concept that generates many questions, for example from a sociological point of view, there are questions like:

What sorts of differences are visible in our society? What sorts of differences have consequences in our society? What do we do about such differences? Where do these differences come from? (Saraga 1998, p.1)

When does a difference count, under what conditions, in what ways, and for what reasons? (Varenne & McDermott 1999 cited in Artiles 2003, p.193)
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The most common view is that in most cases difference is linked to stigma or deviance and sameness is viewed as a pre-requisite for equality (Minow 1990, p.50). The impact of the notion of difference and its definitions is not only a theoretical one; it can impact on how individuals are treated in society; and more specifically in the case of the topic of this thesis, how children are conceptualised and responded to in schools.

2.2 Responding to diversity through individual planning

This section explores the notion of individual planning, firstly by defining what is meant by individual planning and pointing out issues related to the use of the term ‘IEP’ in the literature. Secondly the phenomenon of individual planning will be situated by looking at literature about the way educational systems respond to pupil diversity, namely through a continuum of systems and practices of special and inclusive education.

2.2.1 Defining individual planning

Different names

It was suggested in Chapter 1 that the notion of ‘individual education plan’ or IEP may be used in different contexts and countries to refer to different things. ‘IEPs’ can stand for ‘Individualised educational programmes’ or ‘Individual Education Plans’. I will now discuss how the abbreviation ‘IEP’ has been used internationally in the academic literature to mean different things. Moreover, I will discuss the tensions created by this apparent similarity presented in the literature and explain the need for a generic term that encompasses those differences. I will use ‘individual planning’ to serve this purpose.
IEP stands for Individual Education Plan in England and Individual Educational Programme [Programa Educativo Individual] in Portugal. However, the first presence of 'Individualized Education Programs' in the literature dates back to 1975, in a Handbook for parents of exceptional children in Pennsylvania, US (Montgomery County Intermediate Unit 23 1975). This booklet was a response to the institution of IEPs in the US under the Education for all Handicapped children act in 1975 (Public Law 94-142) and it aimed to explain to parents the processes by which their children would be evaluated, identified, assigned and placed in a program. In fact, a considerable number of publications to date on IEPs adopt a ‘guide’ or ‘handbook’ style. Moreover, they are aimed at parents or families and professionals who work with pupils with disabilities (e.g. Pierangelo & Giuliani 2007; Tod et al. 1998). Thus, the aims of these publications are to explain the legal framework around IEPs in a specific national context and to support the various stakeholders when developing IEPs. Therefore, there is little concern about its use in other countries.

Since the introduction of IEPs in the US in 1975, they have been adopted in many countries’ educational policies. The literature refers to IEPs being used in Europe in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, as well as in other parts of the world like the USA, Canada, and Australia (Millward et al. 2002; Tennant 2007; Mitchell et al. 2010). In fact, Mitchell et al. (2010) in their recent literature review on IEPs claim that they are ‘ubiquitous’ (2010, p.9). These authors refer to 'IEPs or an equivalent' and list the ‘closest’ or ‘equivalent’ documents in various countries. Table 2 illustrates how the reference to IEPs in the literature could be related to a number of individual planning documents.
By looking at the types of individual plans presented in Table 2, different aims and uses can be inferred. Moreover, the target groups of these individual plans can also vary. They can be targeted at pupils in the ‘broad’ SEN category; pupils ‘with behaviour issues’; pupils who are moving between different stages of education; or, as shown on the last row, they can be aimed at all pupils as it is reported to be the case in Sweden, or ‘any’ student as it is described for Finland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘SEN’</td>
<td>Individual(ized) education(al) plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual(ized) Education(al) Program(me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managed Individual Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy and Numeracy Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs for Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiated Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Adjustment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Learning Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Education Plans (or Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personalised Intervention Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Behaviour’</td>
<td>Behaviour support plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior Intervention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Transition’</td>
<td>Transition Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘All’</td>
<td>Learning Plan (Finland - to support students to learn, and teacher to differentiate, can be developed for any student, including immigrant students or gifted students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual development plan (Sweden - all pupils)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Different types of individual planning documents used (Adapted from Mitchell et al. 2010)

This concept of ‘IEP’ is especially problematic in two main circumstances: when information is not provided to contextualise what the specific form of individual planning means in that specific context. Moreover, hence it is left for the readers to fill in that gap with assumptions based on their
experiences. Furthermore, it is challenging when comparing practices and outcomes across countries. This is a more and more common practice particularly in the field of comparative education and through the work of agencies such as The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (EASNIE) and The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Different roles

There is a considerable body of literature about ‘IEPs’ which includes two literature reviews (Millward et al. 2002; Mitchell et al. 2010). In this body of literature there seem to be two main aspects linked to IEPs: they are portrayed as documents, which are designed, implemented and evaluated in schools. In addition, IEPs are seen as a process, which ideally should involve a team of stakeholders (namely teachers, specialists, parents or carers and pupils themselves). The evidence presented in the literature appears to be more positive about the second role.

Tod (1999) summarises some of the key positive features and possible areas of concern of IEPs (See Table 3). The positive aspects include attention being given to creating relevant educational targets; creating procedures and systems which can raise attainment of all pupils; the collaboration between staff, parents and pupils; and how monitoring can provide evidence of the effectiveness of teaching and additional provision. Conversely, there are concerns related to the mismatch between planning and implementation; the risk of SEN provision becoming resource led rather than needs based and only responding to pupil failure; the narrowing of learning objectives for pupils with IEPs; and the impact of IEP bureaucracy on the role of the SENCO; and possible consequent oversimplification of IEPs.
The problematic view of a ‘homogeneous’ notion of IEP is present throughout the literature. For example Tod (1999) focuses on the use of IEPs in the UK and the US. And even though IEPs have significant differences in these two countries, the author fails to acknowledge them by presenting a unified description of positive features and areas of concern.

The roles attributed to IEPs are varied. This variation occurs cross-nationally, as well as within countries and schools. For example if we consider the United States, the IEP is mandatory for all pupils ‘with special needs’. It should specify accommodations and services needed to respond to the educational needs of individual pupils and it has a strong legal status mandated by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (amended in 2004 through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, P.L. 108-446). On the contrary, in England at the time of data collection for this study teachers were not required to prepare IEPs for all pupils with special educational needs as long as they had ‘sound arrangements for monitoring their progress in conjunction with the child and their parents’ (DCSF, 2004, p.23). Additionally, in England in the same time frame the equivalent of the ‘American IEP’ would be a Statement of special educational needs. In the case of Portugal, similarly to the US IEPs are required for all pupils identified as having special educational needs.

The literature presents IEPs as an alternative curriculum, as well as a way to manage, plan, monitor, assess, be accountable, seek resources, decide placement, and involve parents and pupils. IEPs are described as the ‘centrepiece of service delivery and accountability’ (Shriner & Destefano 2003), and are considered extremely important to best practice in special education both as a process and a document (Lee-Tarver 2006; Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive features of IEPs</th>
<th>Areas of concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A vehicle for the development of collaboration and involvement with parents.</td>
<td>The written IEP is not always translated into practice – it thus becomes a cumbersome paperwork exercise which results in a little educational benefit for the pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mechanism for enabling pupils to become more involved in their own learning plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing teacher attention towards the setting and resetting of clear educationally relevant targets</td>
<td>If the SENCO takes on a major administrative role, then his/her expertise in SEN teaching and co-ordination is not being effectively used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving staff in the development and implementation of strategies to meet those targets, thereby improving and sharing classroom practice</td>
<td>The IEP procedure is at risk of being used as an instrument for securing increased resources via ‘evident failure’ – this has been termed ‘perverse incentive’ by those critical of a sequential staged approach to SEN provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a mechanism for providing clearer evidence as to the effectiveness of additional SEN provision</td>
<td>An adherence to an objectives model of teaching via the writing of clear targets may lead to a narrowing of learning opportunities for pupils with SEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnessing available resources to meet those strategies</td>
<td>By having to link targets to provision on the IEP, it may be that SEN will become resource led rather than needs led.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be a vehicle for establishing procedures and systems for raising attainment for all pupils</td>
<td>The use of checklists and commercial IEP schemes and strategies to assist the IEP process could lead back to a ‘remediation of deficit’ model for SEN provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the emphasis on the monitoring of pupil response to teaching</td>
<td>Difficulties with the maintenance and monitoring of IEPs are such that there is a risk that IEPs will either remain static documents or become so simplified that their educational benefit is questionable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - IEPs, positive features and areas of concern (Adapted from Tod et al. 1998; Tod 1999, p.184)
IEP documents are presented as a way of managing the education of pupils with SEN, bringing together the identification, provision and review processes (Frankl 2005). IEPs are a means of planning, monitoring and assessment of achievement and progress, while ensuring that a focus is maintained on the specific learning needs of individual pupils with ‘special educational needs’ (Rose et al. 2012). They are a means of enabling teachers to make adaptations to lesson planning and the curriculum in order to take account of the needs of individuals and to ensure that they gain access to learning alongside their peers (Rose et al. 2012). Therefore, IEPs are viewed as a tool in the process of bringing pupils ‘with special needs’ into mainstream classrooms. However, the process of ‘mainstreaming’ creates dilemmas in which individual planning plays a central role, for example, in decisions regarding the curriculum. The difficulty to find a balance between the right to follow a 'mainstream' curriculum versus the right to individualised planning (Millward et al. 2002; Riddell et al. 2002) are reported to be an issue in many European countries.

Some authors consider that 'it is widely accepted that students with additional support needs benefit substantially from the implementation of individualised, intentional and planned interventions' (Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013, p.507). The majority of mainstream teachers thought IEPs were useful tools in planning and implementing educational goals for children with disabilities and also helped the organisation and structure of their teaching (Lee-Tarver 2006).

The reasoning behind IEPs has, however, been reported to have a strong influence from behavioural psychology. In the sense that the underlying assumption of IEPs is that learning is a process which can be planned and controlled. And complex tasks can be broken down into smaller steps
This rather mechanistic approach to teaching and learning has been reported to ‘distract’ stakeholders from focusing on difficult decisions and attempting to resolve dilemmas posed by diverse pupil populations. It diverts the stakeholders’ attention by shifting the focus from deeper decisions such as the goals of education and the curriculum to ‘how’ to break and teach visible skills. Additionally, ‘there is as yet no evidence that the written IEP is being systematically integrated into teacher planning and translated into classroom practice’ (Tod 1999, p.187). Nonetheless, the IEP’s characteristics are appealing to schools, teachers and parents because it provides a ‘scientific’ rationale and a programme for action (Millward et al. 2002).

The contents of the IEP document can be more or less prescribed by policy and there seem to be issues related to either approach. Prescriptive policy approaches to designing individual plans usually demand mechanistic responses from teachers. These perscriptive approaches may make teachers feel their professional autonomy is under threat. Although this may be true, the lack of prescription seems to signify that individual planning documents become low-status documents. Simultaneously it appears to generate a bigger gap between policy and practice. Moreover, IEPs can be open-ended documents or they may comply with a pre-established design. While ‘tightly specified’ documents limit the teachers’ flexibility, open-ended documents designed by teachers which seem to focus on more areas at the expense of concentrating on measurable outcomes (Millward et al. 2002; Riddell et al. 2002).

A number of authors have reported a series of issues regarding the contents of IEPs (Shriner & Destefano 2003; Mitchell et al. 2010; Gallagher & Desimone 1995), namely that goals and objectives lack clarity and relevance; that there is little correlation between recorded problems and diagnostic
information; that they present lack of congruence between documented academic and behavioural needs and IEP goals; and that the goals focus primarily on academics and lack social, behavioural life skills objectives. Other issues are that there is a focus on activities and participation while overlooking environmental factors (Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013).

IEPs have been reported to be a greater challenge in secondary schools. The reasons for this are the 'operational difficulties' linked to: the number and complexity of academic subjects; the number of professionals involved; the difficulties to schedule joint planning moments with subject teachers and learning support staff; and the problematic relationship between the IEPs and the mainstream curriculum (Riddell et al. 2002; Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013). Some of these issues are reported as possible to overcome through teacher training in designing and implementing IEPs (Lee-Tarver 2006; Tod 1999). And more specifically training teachers in developing functional and measurable goals, and assessing environmental factors as barriers or facilitators (Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013).

The various roles of individual planning documents have been presented in the literature as conflicting (Andreasson et al. 2013; Shaddock 2010). For example, if IEPs are used as a tool to monitor progress and render teachers and schools accountable, then it is likely that teachers would include targets that were likely to show progress, hence moving away from 'child-centred' aims, as having a narrowing effect on what was proposed to SEN pupils (Millward et al., 2001, Riddell et al., 2002).

Process

A more positive outlook on the individual planning process is present in the literature. This is linked to the creation of spaces and moments for
cooperation between various stakeholders, namely the involvement of parents and pupils in deciding educational goals and priorities. This emphasis on the process is usually present in policy documents as a way to enhance pupil and parent participation (Riddell et al. 2002). The ‘who’, ‘how’ and ‘when’ the IEP is developed plays a key in the success of its implementation, for example, Nugent says that:

Developing an IEP is about the collaboration of concerned people in planning for a student’s special educational needs and about how that plan can be brought to life in a meaningful and useful way. (Nugent 2005, p.2)

‘When’ IEPs are developed and ‘who’ is involved in the process has an impact on the implementation of intended participation. IEPs should be developed during the same academic year and involving the teachers who will implement them. This involvement is relevant because sometimes IEPs are seen as being the responsibility of specialist teachers or the SENCO, and other teachers have little input (Shriner & Destefano 2003). Hollenweger and Lienhard (2007) describe the importance of involving teachers, parents or guardians, along with other professionals (e.g. special needs teacher, therapist, educational psychologist) when identifying the pupils’ strengths and difficulties and when discussing ‘what precisely can the school do to improve the situation?’. The authors propose ‘cooperative assessment meetings’ as part of the process of responding to pupils with special needs. In these meetings, all stakeholders are expected to have a voice regarding the pupils’ strengths and difficulties in 10 areas of life. The areas of life are based on the ICF-CY (WHO 2007b) and are: general learning, mathematics learning, language acquisition and concept formation, reading and writing, dealing with requests, communication, movement and mobility, caring for themselves, dealing with people, and leisure, recreation and community.
However, the little empirical evidence suggests this type of cooperative process is a challenge and that it seldom takes place. For example, Goepel (2009) who studied the partnership between teachers, parents and pupils around the development of the IEP, found a dominance of the teachers’ voice, even though she concluded that the pupil input and awareness of their IEP targets was essential to increase learning and participation.

**Comparative research and gaps in the literature**

There seems to be ‘limited evidence relating to procedural and educational aspects’ of individual planning (Tod 1999, p.187). A recent literature review of empirical studies on the topic of IEP development (Blackwell & Rossetti 2014, p.3) found 51 studies published since 1997, of which the majority focused on the IEP content (24 studies), including adequacy of IEP in terms of procedural and substantive requirements, the quality of IEP content, and testing accommodations and participation; 13 studies talked about student participation in the IEP development process; 11 studies referred to the dynamics of IEP meetings; and 3 studies focused on assessment information considerations, including assistive technology, placement, and program development. The studies reviewed seem to accept the IEP as a given and Blackwell and Rossetti (2014, p.12) conclude by highlighting the need to understand how IEPs are developed and implemented for students ‘across the spectrum of disabilities and grade levels’.

This uncritical approach is problematic for two reasons; firstly it does not recognise significant differences in what is meant by IEPs. Secondly, it fails to question whether individual planning is suitable when responding to pupil diversity. These problems are found in much of the literature reviewed for my study. Additionally, most publications draw on information and data from one country only. There are very few cross-national comparative
studies in this field, and even fewer that are conducted by the same person who is knowledgeable about the culture and fluent in the languages of both countries.

Given the differences in what is meant and the several roles played by IEPs, a cross-national study based on a comparative approach to individual educational planning seems a logic step. This study will contribute to filling the knowledge gap around the various uses of individual planning and perceptions around pupils who ‘need’ individual planning. By looking at schools in two countries, it allows me to explore deeper issues and assumptions.

Taking into account the problem of the lack of comparability and limited scope of the IEP concept, in this study I have used the general concept of ‘individual planning’, which I have defined as the existence of a formal plan for provision that is done on a regular basis. This plan does not have to be designed for individuals, but it does have to mention an individual pupil’s name, and the provision can be delivered individually or to groups of pupils. The specific type of individual planning I am interested in is one that is considered applicable or necessary only for some pupils. The reason why I am interested in this form of planning is because it is associated with one way of thinking about pupil diversity which implies a perception that some pupils need something additional to or different from what is provided to their peers. This study will help clarifying what individual educational planning means and how it is used in schools in England and Portugal. Moreover, it will help understanding the mechanisms of construction and management of ‘difference’.
2.3 Contextualising individual planning

Individual planning, as defined in this study, refers to responses to pupil diversity in general, and so it is not limited to responses to pupils considered to have special educational needs. However, to contextualise the use of individual planning in education it is relevant to refer to its original rationale. That is, responding to pupils who previously attended segregated settings and were then integrated into mainstream schools and classrooms. The historical evolution from segregation to integration and later to inclusion is not linear in the sense that some of these responses continue to co-exist. I will now focus on what I see as a continuum of responses which have had an impact, and still do, on how individual planning is perceived and used.

The special – inclusive education continuum

Education is a social goal that is shaped by the medium of an organisation; society wants education, but what it gets is a particular kind of schooling, one that is shaped by the school organisations that are used to provide it (Skrtic 1991a, p.22)

The origins of IEPs are linked to schools' responses to pupils with disabilities and/or SEN, as discussed earlier. More specifically, they are associated with the placement of pupils with disabilities in ‘mainstream’ or ‘regular’ schools. Historically provision for pupils with disabilities, progressed from no provision to segregated or specialist provision; next came a concept of integrated provision and finally to inclusive responses. In reality, this continuum of structural responses to pupils with disabilities and ‘special needs’ continues to exist. At one end of the continuum are pupils who attend segregated settings. This can be special schools or a separated class or unit within a mainstream school. Ainscow (1991a, p.2) refers to three approaches to responding to pupils who are perceived as not being able to follow the mainstream curriculum. These are the withdrawal approach (to a special
class/ school), the remedial approach (intervention to overcome/ compensate deficits) and the mainstreaming approach (e.g. individualised learning programme, adaptation of classroom materials, additional adult support). However, Riddell et al. (2002) suggest IEPs are used in these types of provision.

The 1990s saw thinking about inclusion billow out from a one-dimensional plane, along which one viewed the integration and valuing of children with disabilities and difficulties, to three-dimensional terrain that now incorporates a more extensive spectrum of concerns and discourses - about the benefits that come from valuing diversity. (Thomas & Loxley 2007, p.1)

The concepts of integration and inclusion are similar in terms of pupil placement. In other words, pupils ‘with special needs’ are expected to be in a ‘regular’ classroom along with their peers. This creates challenges when these ‘special’ pupils are not able to do the same things, in the same way and at the same pace as the majority of pupils. And hence individual planning seems to be an appropriate way to cater for the ‘needs’ of that minority. The concepts of integration and inclusion differ however from one another in the sense that ‘inclusion’ was created as a step forward from the notion of integration (Daniels & Garner 1999). Inclusion is nevertheless a ‘fuzzy concept’ (Göransson & Nilholm 2014). This is relevant in terms of individual planning because different ‘types’ of inclusion imply different views of individual planning.

There are two main conceptualisations of inclusion: traditional approaches to inclusion and ‘inclusionary approaches’ to inclusion (Thomas & Loxley 2007). I will now focus on the later which is more embracing in two ways. Firstly, it aims to ensure full and effective participation based on the principle of equality of opportunities. In other words, it is not just about where pupils are placed but the opportunities they are given to participating
in mainstream schools. The literature points to a move in Europe towards creating inclusive education systems which aim to ensure access to quality education for all children based on principles of participation, equity, rights, and ethics (Pijl et al. 1997; Thomas & Vaughan 2004; Dyson 1999).

Secondly, ‘inclusion’ widens the target population given that ‘Inclusion is about all pupils, not just a few.’ (Mittler 2000, p.177). While some authors view that more embracing definition of inclusion as a negative move because it deviates the attention from responding to specific circumstances of disability and difficulties’ (Norwich 2013), others defend the position that it is inappropriate to differentiate among factors that contribute to children’s difficulties at school, such as disability, language, family income, cultural or ethnic origin, and gender (Thomas & Loxley 2007, p.124).

‘Inclusionary approaches’ to inclusive education imply whole school policies and practices and restructuring schools to accommodate all pupils; they entail participation and not just placement or location (Norwich 2008a, p.19). Teaching factors are assessed when trying to understand pupil’s difficulties. And collaborative problem-solving processes should be at the heart of developing strategies to accommodate all learners. The focus is on the classroom with a view to create an adaptive and supportive regular classroom environment.

However, the rhetoric around IEPs is that there is a focus on the student ‘with SEN’ who needs to be assessed. The outcome of this assessment is a diagnostic and prescriptive document, which is used to develop a student programme. So, it seems that some aspects of IEPs are not in line with ‘inclusionary approaches’ to inclusion.

A lot has been written about inclusive education over the past two decades, its meaning in different contexts (See for example Armstrong et al. 2010;
Mitchell 2005; Dyson 2001b), as well as ways of creating more inclusive schools and environments (e.g. Booth & Ainscow 2002). Inclusion in this thesis is understood as a broad term that is concerned with issues of disability, gender, social class/socio-economic status, poverty, ethnic background, and language when attempting to ensure the meaningful participation of all pupils in schools in an equitable way. This notion of inclusion poses challenges to existing educational systems when confronted with a growth of the school population and a diversification of learners. Until a few decades ago, this mainstream school population did not involve for instance children with disabilities, children from lower socio-economic backgrounds or children whose first language is not the language used in school. Educational systems that have been developed based on principles of homogenisation, organising students in classes and assuming a hierarchic progression depending on the acquisition of knowledge and progress towards the desired norm (Roldão 2003, p.153).

The schools as organisations

The organisation and curriculum of schools remain broadly the same since they are assumed to be appropriate for the great majority of children (Ainscow 1991a, p.2)

The structure of schools as organisations did not change significantly (Roldão 1999). Schools tend to have standard aims and teaching practices for students, and complex bureaucracies that make them organisations in which change is extremely difficult to take place. According to Skrtic school organisations are institutionalised bureaucracies, which do not change on demand. Schools respond to pupils en masse and often assume a homogeneous student population. A way of dealing with demands to change, given this bureaucratic character, is to create separate subunits and subsystems such as ‘special education’. In fact, reforms such as integration
which attempt to make schools more inclusive, make schools more bureaucratic, and less adaptable and inclusive (Skrtic 1991a; Skrtic 2005).

The suggestion that students in a classroom can work towards different aims, and in different ways, creates responses such as ‘setting or separate grouping of children in order to fulfil their responsibility for providing for differences’ (Hart 1992). For example, in English schools there is a range of practices of grouping pupils according to their perceived ability. In Portugal, ‘ability’ grouping is not common but there are similar issues in the way ‘classes’ are formed. What was initially just a way of organising pupils in larger schools (Barroso 2003) became an organisational pattern to departmentalise teachers and spaces. Later it became a ‘gauge’ of success, that is, being retained in a grade or ‘moving up a grade’. Moreover, some of the apparently neutral and ‘harmless’ criteria for organising ‘class groups’ [turmas] gave rise to the creation of good and bad ‘classes’ (Cortesao 1998).

The criteria for grouping pupils into classes are inequitable in principle, and they result in the creation of homogenous groups. Schools use criteria to group pupils into the same class like (1) a first come, first served basis, (2) pupils’ age, (3) living areas, e.g. neighbourhoods, (4) previous class groups, (5) previous academic achievement, (6) social and ethnic group. Instead of ‘deliberately aim to create heterogeneous class groups and invest in learning to gain from the wealth created by pupil diversity’ (Cortesao 1998).

The subsystems, created as a response to demands for change, have an impact on teacher perception of their pupils and of their own ability to teach:

Unfortunately, special education has been so successful at continuously devising more glossy and more elaborate forms of assessment and pedagogy that teachers have begun to lose confidence in their own ability to assess and teach all children in their charge. Children who are difficult to teach have become by default ‘special’ children (Thomas & Loxley 2007, p.27)
So, some pupils come to be perceived by their teachers and schools as needing ‘special’ responses. A common assumption is that ‘differences among learners normally follow a bell-shaped distribution’ (Meijer 2013). The notions of ‘bell-curve distribution’ and ‘fixed ability’ still underpin the structure of schooling even though they have been considered a challenge to create inclusive practices (Florian & Spratt 2013, p.124).

To a great extent ‘special education’ has been criticised by academics as a response to pupil diversity:

[The] legacy that 100 years of special education has given to teachers is that they need all sorts of special procedures, qualifications and techniques to help them understand and help ‘special’ children. (Thomas & Loxley 2007, p.27).

Special education is a non-rational and uncoordinated practice that emerged in the 20th century industrialised democracies to contain the inherent contradiction between the democratic goal of universal public education and the bureaucratic school organisations that were used to address it. (Skrtic 1991a, p.21)

‘Special education’ is a product of the intrinsic contradictions at the heart of educational systems. For example, the notion of inclusion as meaningful participation and success for all pupils conflicts with the governmental focus on standards (Dunne et al. 2011; Ainscow et al. 2006; Artiles 2003). The focus on standards often implies a narrow view of pupil achievement. These conflicting priorities are played out daily in schools and have been theorised in the literature as dilemmas of difference.

The dilemmas

The theme of ‘dilemmas of difference’ in education is well-established. It originates from a commitment to equity and egalitarian values. And consists of ‘an intention to treat all learners as essentially the same and an equal and opposite intention to treat them as different’ (Dyson 2001b, p.25), a choice ‘to
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provide equal or preferential treatment’ (Artiles 2003, p.194). Norwich considers dilemmas of difference a ‘decision-oriented view about hard choices where all options have some unfavourable consequences’ (Norwich 2008a, p.7), ‘a choice between unfavourable alternatives’, in which one must accept the ‘inescapability of conflict and necessity of tragic choice’ (Norwich 2008a, p.3). So, dilemmas call for resolutions rather than solutions (Norwich 2007, p.73).

Norwich has written extensively on the issue of dilemmas of difference in education (Norwich 2010; Norwich 2013; Norwich 2009; Norwich 2008b; Norwich 2008a; Norwich 2007; Norwich 2002). He identified three key dilemmas: identification, curriculum and location. The identification dilemma refers to the fact that some pupils in schools are identified as having special educational needs. This identification is usually linked to being entitled to additional and/ or different resources namely individual planning and provision. However, being identified as having SEN is also connected to issues of stigmatisation (Ho 2004). This perspective fails to acknowledge that some pupils are still perceived as ‘different’, even without the ‘SEN’ label. This phenomenon is linked to the characteristics of school organisations described in the previous section. Furthermore, it is underpinned by the conceptualisation of the pupil population as homogeneous and by the fact that ‘some’ pupils have ‘different needs’. This difference seems to create practical challenges for teachers, rather than ‘just’ dilemmas.

Secondly, the curricula dilemma refers to the curriculum. It involves considerations of whether ‘common curriculum programmes should be used and when specialised programmes are more suitable’ (Norwich 2007, p.72). Individual planning is involved in this dilemma as it is used, in some cases,
as a tool in the process of adapting the mainstream curriculum, or designing and implementing ‘specialised’ responses.

Finally, the location dilemma may be defined as the decisions regarding pupil placement. This dilemma can involve the choice between a mainstream or special school and special unit setting, but it could also refer to the organisation of classes and the organisation within classes. For example in groups of similar ‘ability’ or ‘mixed-ability’.

The change over time in the proportion of children and types of need identified to receive different levels and forms of provision may be related to some of these unresolved dilemmas of difference. The processes of categorisation and responding to pupil diversity are based on a case-by-case decision-making process that is 'neither transparent nor self-evidently rational' (Dyson 2001a, p.100). This type of decision-making is a 'messy process influenced by many individuals and conducted in an environment of rationed resources' (McLaughlin et al. 2006, p.46). So, the increased number of pupils identified as having SEN and disabilities may be an indication of 'inadequate general education system as well as increasing diversity among children in today’s schools' (Florian & McLaughlin 2008b). Thus, changes in identification and provision are not exclusively related to changes in children's characteristics, and this is problematic because 'the outcomes for children with apparently similar needs are unacceptably variable' (Dyson 2001a). For example, it has been reported that there is a disproportionality of students from certain social groups and ethnic backgrounds being identified as having SEN (Artiles 1998; Dyson & Gallannaugh 2008). The influence of social class and SEN has also been observed in decisions of grouping students by ability or setting (Muijs & Dunne 2010). These situations raise deeper issues of educational and social equity, which are related to wider
cultural constructions, to how schools establish who 'the norm' students are and how difference is perceived.

Although a lot has been written about dilemmas of difference, it is interesting that there is little research exploring 'how such dilemmas are played out in practice as part of situated social processes' (Nilholm 2006, p.435). This study will explore dilemmatic situations related to individual planning for pupils who are perceived by their teachers as needing something different from, or additional to what is provided to their peers.

**Other responses to pupil diversity**

National governments often present individual planning as a way forward in overcoming the challenges posed by pupil diversity. It can be considered a flexible response as it is applicable to most types of formal education settings, from early years to secondary school, from special schools to mainstream schools. Furthermore, using individual planning allows minimal changes to be made to the organisational structure of schools. However, researchers and academics have suggested other ways of responding to pupil diversity.

Given the critique of individual planning being time consuming to design and not very useful in terms of daily planning (Millward et al. 2002), some authors present alternatives by reducing the number of pupils with IEPs through the use of GEPs (Group education plans) (Frankl 2005). Furthermore, Booth (2003) suggests that to achieve a more inclusive approach teachers and schools need to develop teaching and learning plans rather than IEPs. Skrtic (1991a) proposes that the way forward is to substitute the existing bureaucracy that characterises schools by an adhocratic configuration. An adhocratic organisation implies that schools are geared to problem-solving and premised on the principle of innovation.
Problem-solving approaches have been suggested as a way forward to creating more equitable education systems, that are ‘more responsive to the needs of all pupils’ (Ainscow 2001, p.4). Ainscow (1991b) argues that staff development and a reflective attitude towards their own practice are key for teachers to better accommodate the diversity of needs within their classes. For example, Skrtic claims that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act 1975 (PL 94–142) had the goal of creating an adhocratic school organisation in which ‘educational problems are solved by interdisciplinary teams of professionals and parents who collaborate to invent personalised programmes for students’ (Skrtic 1991a, p.32).

Furthermore, alternative responses to pupil diversity include adaptations to the curriculum at the level of whole class planning. Whole class planning means rethinking the ways in which learning experiences are organised and presented for the whole class (Hart 1992; Sim-Sim 2005). An example of these ‘inclusive’ responses to pupil diversity is the notion of inclusive pedagogy, which implies:

> a shift in pedagogical thinking from an approach that works for most learners existing alongside something 'additional' or 'different' for those (some) who experience difficulties, towards one that involves providing rich learning opportunities that are sufficiently made available for everyone, so that all learners are able to participate in classroom life. This new approach to individual differences is distinguished from earlier notions about inclusive education and inclusive practice, which are based on the process of providing for all by differentiating for some. By focusing on what is to be learned by the community of learners in a classroom, the inclusive pedagogical approach aims to avoid the problems and stigma associated with marking some learners as different.’ (Florian & Black-Hawkins 2011, p.826)
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Curriculum differentiation, however, is neither as simple nor straightforward as these studies often presume (Hayes & Deyhle 2000)

Differentiation is commonly associated with responding to pupil diversity. Differentiation differs from the notion of individual planning as, by and large, it targets classes as a whole rather than ‘some’ individuals. This procedure was a response to the implementation of the national curriculum in educational systems. In England, the term ‘differentiation’ has since the late 1980s increasingly entered the everyday usage of teachers and has become a priority issue in many school development plans (Hart 1996). The concept became particularly important as a response to the introduction of the National Curriculum in the context of adapting the curriculum to take individual differences into account. Differentiation was a way of adapting what was taught to the ‘needs, abilities and attainments of learners’, it involved ‘meeting individual educational needs in the social context of providing education for all’ (Norwich 1994, p.298).

Dyson and Skidmore (2002) argue that ‘if pupils are to participate in a common curriculum despite their functional difficulties, then that curriculum has to be delivered in ways which are differentiated to take account of those difficulties’ (2002, p.180). Norwich refers to differentiation in a wider sense, including ’differentiation, whether in the curriculum or organisation of schooling and teaching, is an inherent aspect of education’ (Norwich 1994, p.301).

Differentiation is a concept that seems to have several meanings. It includes practices such as having different targets, different activities, and different (physical or human) resources for some pupils; it can also involve grouping pupils by their perceived ability. It can be defined broadly as a school practice that includes the quality of the curriculum, teaching strategies and
teacher and community expectations (Hayes & Deyhle 2000). Differentiation implies an aim to accommodate differences in children’s abilities, aptitudes and needs by performing ‘a set of judgements and procedures’ which include ‘organisational strategies (separating children into groups or classes on the basis of particular criteria) and teaching strategies (matching tasks and approaches to learners’ individual characteristics) (Hart 1992; Hart 1996).

Norwich suggests that at an organisational level differentiation can be done at three levels: school types (comprehensive or specialist - grammar, special, technology), class composition (mixed ability or ability grouped classes: general ability streaming, subject specific grouping and special classes/ units); and teaching (individual, group: similar or cross ability), and class teaching (Norwich 1994). Moreover, he identifies four aspects of the curriculum that can be differentiated: educational aims, curricular programmes (broad goals, structure and content), objectives (levels and tasks), teaching approaches (grouping, style, pace and assessing) (Norwich 1994). Leite (2005) proposes that the national curriculum needs to be adapted to the school, to the class and individually to some of the pupils, namely those ‘with SEN’, based on a principle of flexibility of the curriculum. This involves five aspects that can be modified at class level: organisation of space and equipment, activities and strategies, human and material resources, assessment and time allocation, and contents and aims.

Sousa (2008; Sousa 2010) suggests that differentiation can be based on principles of inclusion. This involves an adaptation of the curriculum to the characteristics of each pupil with a view to maximise his or her opportunities of success. Hart proposes that differentiation is a positive concept when it implies that learning opportunities are determined by complex dynamics, and that there is always potential for moving beyond existing limits. In other words, that the development of the existing practice should be considered
always possible by enhancing learning opportunities of individual children within the provision made for all (Hart 1996).

There can also be non-inclusive approaches to differentiation which involve creating groups based on ‘ability’ levels, and alternative educational ‘pathways’ with implicit high and low ‘prestige’ (Sousa 2008; Sousa 2010). Many models of differentiation are actually based on notions of ‘homogenisation’. The differentiation strategies are temporary and with the aim of ‘correcting deviations from the norm’, ‘neutralising differences’ and rapid return to ‘curricular normality’ (Sousa 2008; Sousa 2010). This resonates with Norwich’s view (1994), that positive views of differentiation focus on ‘within classroom differentiation of teaching and the more negative views on the organisational aspects of the school system and broad curricula levels’ (1994, p.292). He elaborates by proposing two aspects of differentiation - the ‘technical’ side of how to adapt teaching and the ‘values’ aspect and arising dilemmas of equality and individuality.

Differentiation is a common practice in some contexts, and ‘discourses of good practice insistently promote differentiation by ability as an essential feature of good teaching’ (Hart et al. 2004, p.5). Furthermore, educational differentiation mediates the relationship between socioeconomic background and student achievement (Marks et al. 2006). In other words, attainment, gender, ethnic background, socio-economic background (material, social, economic resources) are determinants of educational differentiation, in the sense that the pupils’ background influences which schools and curriculum they gain access to. Moreover, it has been argued that curricular differentiation may create educational, social and economic inequality, namely for pupils from minority and low socio-economic backgrounds (Hayes & Deyhle 2000). Differentiation has also been criticised for its focus on pupil differences, ignoring the importance of context and providing an
excuse for 'the routine separation of children', which can have negative effects on the pupils' self-esteem and learner identity (Hart 1996, p.10). Hart reiterates the need to plan for classes as a whole while taking into account all individuals; rather than using traditional individual planning practices. These entail adapting a pre-existing plan to the needs of some:

We realise that we may, in fact, perpetuate children's difficulties if we differentiate our teaching on the basis of evidence of their achievements within existing arrangements rather than questioning how those achievements may themselves be limited by the range of learning opportunities provided. (Hart 1996, p.11)

Furthermore, Rodrigues (2003) considers that although the differentiation of the curriculum has been in schools for a long time, it has not necessarily been used with the aim of creating more inclusive practices, as the curriculum is used as an excuse to 'keep the school as it is'. Curricular differentiation has been claimed to be implicitly associated with 'remedial therapy' for the challenges felt in schools as a result of the diversification of the pupil population (Roldão 2003). Moreover, the literature critiques the rhetorical use of differentiation to hide the actual unchanged practice based on an 'uniformitarian' approach. In this approach difference is seen as an issue rather than a resource; pupils are organised homogeneously, and those perceived as different need to work separately with the excuse of 'supporting them' (Roldão 2003).

The more positive side of differentiation is linked to the attempt to respond to pupil diversity through flexible teaching, by trying to provide learning experiences for pupils that generate 'interest, understanding, confidence and a sense of success' (Camilletti 1996, p.39). If we consider it objectively it is rather similar to the aims of personalising learning. Taking a more 'revolutionary' approach (Roldão 2003) suggests that the way forward implies alternative forms of school organisation, namely through a different
use of teachers, time and space, which should not be based on the class group as a unit, on the teacher as the one-way distributor of knowledge, and on time and space that segmented and compartmentalised.

**Personalisation**

Personalisation is a concept that is also relevant when referring to responses to pupil diversity. It is used in a different way to individual planning and IEPs, with other aspects of difference in mind. Personalisation has been used over the past ten years to refer to the need to create responses which are more flexible and tailored to each individual’s learning style, previous knowledge, interests and preference. The OECD has a strong rhetoric that ‘personalisation of learning has become imperative’ because there is now a growing awareness that ‘one-size-fits-all’ approaches to school knowledge and organisation are ill-adapted both to individuals’ needs and to the knowledge society at large’ (OECD 2006).

There are three main views of personalisation. Firstly, it is viewed as a synonym of adaptation and individual differentiation (OECD 2006). Secondly, it is considered a new name for the ‘individually-responsive forms of provision’ needed to develop inclusive practices (Ainscow 2007). And thirdly, it has been considered the way forward where individualisation cannot resolve the challenges associated with a diverse school population. A substantial confusion about what ‘personalised learning’ means is reported in the literature, namely ‘personalised’ being interpreted as a synonym of ‘individualised’ (Sebba et al. 2007; Sebba 2011).

Personalisation can include:

- curricular organisation and flexibility, curriculum entitlement and choice, extended curriculum and supporting children’s wider needs;
- development of pupils’ competence and confidence;
- assessment for learning and focused assessment, based around student progress, on the strengths and weaknesses of individual students;
- high-quality effective teaching and learning;
- school organisation and partnership beyond the school and classroom;
- pupil voice (Sebba 2011; OECD 2006)

In terms of the target pupil population, personalisation has been presented in two different ways: as having a focus on all pupils (Sebba 2011; OECD 2006; Goepel 2009; Ainscow et al. 2007), for example:

reaching as many pupils as possible, for as much of the time as possible, thus emphasising participation’ (Sebba 2011)

personalised learning can be seen as an approach in educational policy and practice whereby every student matters. It equalises learning opportunities in terms of learning skills and motivation to learn’ (OECD 2006)

the need to move from an individualised planning frame, to a perspective that seeks to personalise learning through an engagement with the whole class. (Ainscow et al. 2007, p.Xii)

In some cases it is associated with ‘special populations’ like ‘gifted and talented students’ (Sebba 2011; OECD 2006) or ‘SEN’:

children with SEN [should be] at the heart of personalised learning, helping schools to vary the pace and approach to learning to meet individual children’s needs (DfES 2004)

An effective use of personalisation is expected to decrease the needs for individualisation, and to ‘reduce the need for elaborate IEPs’ (Goepel 2009, p.127). In fact, personalising learning is seen by Sebba as an alternative to individual planning. The author claims that an individualised provision is unlikely to be achievable for all students; it is highly demanding on resources and hence not sustainable in the longer term, and ‘individualising’ does not necessarily provide effective personalisation:
Focusing on ‘personalised’ rather than ‘individualised’ creates the potential to recognise the ‘personal’ in teaching, learning and schooling so that all pupils experience and are motivated by a sense of belonging and view the learning as relevant to them. Encouraging participation rather than individualisation provides a more positive way forward. If personalised learning is about maximising participation and involvement in decision-making as co-investors in education, then addressing the needs of all pupils through a rights and justice approach (drawing on capability theory) could provide the means for this to happen (Sebba 2011, p.210).

In practical terms, personalisation would either require considerable structural changes in how schools and teachers function; or it is a ‘theoretical concept’, as it seems indicated in some policy documents, for example:

> We need to provide a personalised education that brings out the best in every child, that builds on their strengths, enables them to develop a love of learning; and helps them to grow into confident and independent citizens, valued for the contribution they make (DfES 2004)

### 2.4 Summary

This review of the literature has served a number of purposes. I have discussed the shortcomings of the concept of IEP, by examining the different ‘names’ and roles associated with IEPs. I have contextualised individual planning, by outlining the continuum of settings in which it is used; the characteristics of school organisation; and the dilemmas that arise when responding to a diverse pupil population. I have also presented other responses to pupil diversity which have some similarities with individual planning and have an impact on the way individual planning is used. I have explored the notions of diversity and difference in education and in other social sciences, by identifying various aspects of diversity; the impact of social constructions; and assumptions about difference.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This thesis will pursue the aims of understanding the mechanisms of conceptualisation of difference in education, through the perceived need for individual planning and provision for some students; and of comparing the processes and underlying assumptions in schools in England and Portugal, in order to explore the impact of cultural aspects and system characteristics.

In the next chapter I outline the characteristics of the educational systems in England and Portugal.
In this chapter I present the main features of the English and Portuguese educational systems. The aim was not to give a full account of the educational systems; my aim was to provide the reader with contextual information to understand the data presented in the Chapters 5 and 6. The chapter is divided into two sections, the first on dedicated to England and the second to Portugal. Moreover, each section is structured to present firstly factual information about the present system: how it is organised, the different types of schools and the approach to special and inclusive education. Secondly, it examines key aspects of the cultural and historical factors that have an impact on how each system has developed.

This chapter will set the scene for the analysis presented over the following chapters, as it will briefly provide the reader with social, cultural and historical information on how the schools operate in the two countries.

Table 4 presents the names of each key stage or cycle and year in both countries, these are organised based on the age pupils are expected to be in each grade (middle column). The years selected for this study were Years 2 and 6 in England and Years 1 and 4 in Portugal. The reasons to focus on these year groups are explained in the Methodology chapter (Chapter 4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Key Stage 1</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One teacher for all subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Key Stage 2</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1st cycle</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd cycle</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Subject organisation</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3rd cycle</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 teacher per subject</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3rd cycle</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6th form/A level</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - English and Portuguese Education System (matched by expected attendance age)

3.1 England

3.1.1 General education system

The education system is divided into five stages of education: early years, primary, secondary, Further Education (FE) and Higher Education (HE). This study included primary and secondary schools. Education is compulsory for all children and young people from the age of 5 up to the age of 16 years old, and from 2015 it will be extended to 17-year-olds. Primary education consists of key stage 1 (years 1 and 2) for 5 to 7 year olds, and key stage 2 (years 3 to 6) for 7 to 11 year olds. Secondary education is composed by key stage 3 (years 7 to 9) for 11 to 14 year olds, and key stage 4 (years 10 and 11) for 14 to 16 year olds (See Table 4).

There are various types of school, which vary in the way they are funded and managed (Gov.UK 2014). In this study:
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- Elephant High School is a community school. That means that it is managed by the local authorities and must follow the national curriculum;

- Emu Church of England High School and Elm Academy are academies. This means they are publicly funded, managed by a governing body, and they can follow a different curriculum;

- Eel Roman Catholic High School, Eucalyptus Roman Catholic Primary School, Elderberry Roman Catholic High School, Echinacea Roman Catholic College are voluntary aided schools. They are managed by a governing body. These are faith schools associated with a particular religion;

- Eagle Church of England Primary School is a voluntary controlled school. It is managed by the local authority.

For other key information about the schools see Appendix 15. Parents or carers are, in principle, entitled to choose the schools their children attend. This variety of types of school illustrates the neo-liberal policies and marketisation of schooling that characterises the English educational system:

  schools are in competition with each other for pupils and resources as their test results are published, and ranked in league tables. Schools are subjected to a rigorous inspection regime where narrowly defined academic attainment is the marker of a ‘good school’. Clearly, the marketisation of schooling is intertwined with the standards agenda (Runswick-Cole 2011, p.116)

The Department for Education (DfE) oversees and regulates education in England. However much of the management is done at the local and school level by the Local Authorities and by academy trusts. According to the OECD Country Report for the United Kingdom (OECD 2012c, p.14), in 2011
schools in England had the greatest decision-making authority, after the Netherlands. Nonetheless, the trend is a decrease in the percentage of decisions made at school level (from 85% of the decisions in 2003 to 75% in 2011) and also at central level (from 11% in 2003 to 4% in 2007). This is linked to an increase of decisions taken at the local level (from 4% in 2003 to 25% in 2011).

Since 1988 there is a National Curriculum, which includes programmes of study and attainment targets for all subjects, at all key stages. It lists the core subjects as compulsory at all key stages (KS) which are English, Mathematics and Science. The national curriculum lists the attainment targets which every pupil should reach by the end of each key stage. Teachers are expected to individualise and differentiate their teaching to reach and challenge all the pupils in their lessons. This usually implies lesson plans differentiated according to the complexity of targets to be achieved by pupils.

The tripartite lesson was proposed in the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies for both primary and secondary school. This means that lessons should be organised into three macro sections: an introduction or starter activity, the main activity/ies and a plenary. Even though this policy is no longer in use, the practice is still common. Due to the expectations laid by the Literacy and Numeracy National Strategies Frameworks, many primary schools decided to group pupils according to their ‘ability’. Pupils were organised into level groups especially for the core subjects (English, Mathematics and in some cases Sciences).

3.1.2 The approach to special and inclusive education

In terms of special needs and disabilities, the general educational system in England is based on a multi-track approach (EADSNE 2003) which includes mainstream and special schools (Human Rights Joint Committee 2009); as
well as special units within mainstream schools, and mainstream schools based on an ‘inclusion’ approach. The National Strategies for Inclusion propose personalising learning, target setting and small group or one-to-one interventions.

Until recently mainstream schools responded to student needs through a multilevel system. This was based on a three stage approach that involved pupils being identified as ‘School Action’ and ‘School Action Plus’ and some pupils having a ‘Statement’ of Special Educational Needs. Statements (and from 2014 EHCs) are developed following an assessment made by the local authority. Pupils will only have an assessment if they have a disability or educational need that requires external resources to be involved in the educational process. England uses a needs based approach which is non-categorical (OECD 2005). The concept of SEN is used regardless of the cause for students being identified. Schools have a SEN Register that lists the pupils identified as having SEN, and information on the stage of the Code of Practice (SA, SA+, Statement), and the SEN category. There are four broad areas of need and support, these are communication and interaction, cognition and learning, social, emotional and mental health, sensory and/ or physical needs.

The 2001 SEN Code of practice states that

Children have special educational needs if they have a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for them.

And explains that children have a learning difficulty if they:

a) have a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of the same age; or

b) have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for
children of the same age in schools within the area of the local education authority

c) are under compulsory school age and fall within the definition at (a) or (b) above or would so do if special educational provision was not made for them.

Children must not be regarded as having a learning difficulty solely because the language or form of language of their home is different from the language in which they will be taught. (DfES 2001)

The definition of SEN in the 2014 Code of Practice, remains similar to what was presented in the previous code of practice. It defines pupils with SEN as those who have ‘learning difficulties’ and have ‘significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others of the same age’. But it also refers to the existence of disabilities which prevent or hinder pupils from ‘making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age in mainstream schools’ and hence ‘call for special educational provision to be made’.

So, in the English context SEN means that ‘the individual student has a greater degree of difficulty learning than the ‘majority of his peers’ or requires some special intervention to ensure that he or she can access or benefit from the education’ (DfES 2001; McLaughlin et al. 2006).

Furthermore, the concept of SEN is constructed as a continuum of difficulties to follow the contents of the mainstream curriculum. For this reason, it has been observed that low achievement is often considered an indicator of special needs (Dyson & Gallannaugh 2008; McLaughlin et al. 2006; Dyson & Hick 2005). The new code of practice (2014) replaces Statements with ‘Education, Health and Care plans’ (EHC plans). It refers to a ‘1-page profile’ for pupils who do not have EHC plans that explains what is important to the pupil, the pupil’s educational needs, what the pupil wants to achieve, and
how the pupil feels their teacher can help them for pupils who do. It does not mention IEPs, which were defined in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES 2001):

Strategies employed to enable the child to progress should be recorded within an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP should include information about: the short-term targets set for or by the child; the teaching strategies to be used; the provision to be put in place; when the plan is to be reviewed; success and/or exit criteria; outcomes (to be recorded when IEP is reviewed).

The IEP should only record that which is additional to or different from the differentiated curriculum plan, which is in place as part of provision for all children. The IEP should be crisply written and focus on three or four individual targets, chosen from those relating to the key areas of communication, literacy, mathematics, and behaviour and social skills that match the child’s needs. The IEP should be discussed with the child and the parents.

Where a child with identified SEN is at serious risk of disaffection or exclusion the IEP should reflect appropriate strategies to meet their needs. A Pastoral Support Programme should not be used to replace the graduated response to special educational needs.

Pupils with SEN who are not ‘able to access’ the national curriculum, are assessed using Performance scales (P scales) which to report attainment for pupils aged 5 to 16 with SEN who are working below level 1 of the national curriculum.

3.1.3 Cultural and historical aspects that influence thinking and procedures around individual planning

In this section I present the cultural and historical background which has a bearing in the thinking and procedures around individual planning. For a more detailed version of the historical background and context around inclusion and special education see for example Dyson, Norwich and Warnock (Dyson & Millward 2000; Warnock & Norwich 2010; Norwich 2008a).
Raveaud (2005) claims that primary schools in England descend from three different traditions: the elementary school of the 19th century, the public schools and from progressive ideals based on child-centred approaches. These traditions have an impact on how schools function nowadays and on ‘the emphasis on respecting and valuing the individual and developing the full potential of each child’ (Raveaud 2005, p.463). The first tradition had a preoccupation with teaching habits of obedience, hygiene and morality; the second, had an emphasis on character building and strengthening the mind, body and soul and the latest was concerned with educating the child as a whole and fostering the intellectual, physical, moral, social and emotional development of pupils. Some of these principles can be seen in the Every Child Matters Framework (DfES 2003), which presents five intended outcomes for children and young people: stay safe, be healthy, enjoy and achieve, make a positive contribution, achieve economic well-being.

The 1988 Education Act, was one of the biggest policy changes in England. It introduced a National Curriculum (NC) and ‘inaugurated the league tables in which schools would compete against each other according to their academic results’ (Warnock & Norwich 2010, p.20). The NC had a vast impact on SEN policy. It created a growing focus on achievement and standards. It introduced the practice of setting attainment targets and of grouping children by their perceived ability. At the time this study was conducted, the attainment targets for most subjects ranged from Levels 1 to 8. Pupils are expected to progress up the levels as they get older and learn more. Even though there is considerable flexibility, as reported in the quote below, most 7 year olds are expected to achieve Level 2; most 11 year olds are expected to achieve Level 4; and most 14 year olds are expected to achieve Levels 5 or 6 (DfE n.d.). Raveaud considers that:
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The range of attainment is in fact so wide that high achieving seven-year-old is expected to reach the same level (i.e. level 3) as a low achieving pupil twice that age, without either pupil being considered particularly exceptional according to the official target (Raveaud 2005, p.463).

The English Government has a tradition of appointing Committees of Enquiry and producing consultation documents, examples of this are the Warnock report, the Lamb Inquiry report, the 2006 report of the Select Committee on Special Educational Needs, and the 2011 Green paper on special educational needs and disability. In terms of special needs education and inclusion the Warnock Report (Department for Education and Science 1978) was a landmark in the way schools conceptualised and responded to pupils with ‘learning difficulties’, the committee led by Mary Warnock proposed the concept of ‘special educational needs’ and ‘supported the principle of educating children with SEN in mainstream or ordinary schools’ (Norwich 2008a, p.47).

The 1997 ‘Green Paper: Excellence For All Children Meeting Special Educational Needs’, was also relevant since it supported the idea of inclusion and mainstreaming as presented in the 1994 Salamanca Statement.

The 2011 ‘Green Paper: Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability’, was quite controversial amongst parents, activists, and organisations of persons with disabilities due to its claims that ‘the bias towards inclusion should be removed and parental choice should be strengthened’. It proposed to achieve parental choice by ‘improving the range and diversity of schools from which parents can choose’, (DfE 2011b). Neo-liberal market principles have a strong impact on educational policies (See for e.g. Runswick-Cole 2011). The competition and marketisation of schools is also present in the responses to pupils with SEN.
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3.2.1 General education system

The education system includes four main levels: pre-school education, basic education, secondary education and higher education (See Table 4, p. 74). Pre-school education is aimed at children from 3 to 6 years old and includes state services, and private or cooperative pre-schools. The next stage of education is usually referred to as basic education and is divided into three cycles:

- the first cycle which used to be called ‘primary education’ lasts 4 years, Year 1 to Year 4, and generally pupils are aged 6 to 10 years old;

- the second cycle lasts 2 years, referred to as Year 5 and Year 6, and pupils tend to be 10 to 12 years old;

- the third cycle consists of 3 years (years 7 to 9) and pupils are aged 12 to 15 years old. Until 2009 this was the end of compulsory schooling (increased to 18 years old through the Law 85/2009 and 12 years of schooling through Decree-Law 176/2012).

The 1st cycle is taught by a single teacher, although some schools hire specialised teachers to teach physical expression. The 2nd and 3rd cycle are very similar in their organisation, they are usually based in the same school and share their infrastructures. Furthermore, from Year 5 there are specialist teachers for each subject and a head of class [diretor de turma] who is one of these teachers and is responsible for the communication between the school and the family, for the coordination of all subject teachers of that class, and for getting to know the pupils into greater depth (the role of the head of class was defined in the Ministerial ordinance 921/92). Finally, secondary education lasts three years (Year 10, 11, and 12). There are six different paths
of which only three, have a structure and curriculum stipulated centrally, and allow pupils to continue studying at university level. The paths include scientific-humanistic, artistic, professional, vocational and secondary education for those over the age of compulsory schooling.

Although school enrolment of 5-14 year-olds is reportedly universal, and attainment levels have increased in Portugal, children of parents with low levels of education are unlikely to attain a higher level of education than their parents. (OECD 2012b, p.10). The staff-pupil ratio in state schools is on average 1-15, ranging from 1-14.1 in pre-school to 1-7.7 in secondary school (Rodrigues & Nogueira 2011).

There are centralised national exams of Portuguese, Maths and Portuguese as an additional language at the end of Year 4, Year 6, Year 9; and in secondary school depending on the subject areas chosen by pupils there are exams at the end of years 10 or 11 and 12, the subjects examined are Philosophy, Portuguese or Portuguese non-maternal language, Latin, Physics and chemistry, History of culture and arts, Drawing, History, Biology and geology, Mathematics Applied to Social Sciences, Mathematics, Geometry, Portuguese literature, Latin, Geography, Economics, English, French, Spanish and German.

The National Curriculum for primary school, complemented by the Order 19 575/2006, is rather prescriptive in terms of contents and planning. All schools must follow the national curriculum, which defines the skills and competencies for each grade. The curriculum areas in the 1st cycle are

- Portuguese (minimum 7 weekly hours),
- Mathematics (min. 7h/week),
- ‘Environment study’ [‘Estudo do Meio’, equivalent to science] (min. 3h/week),
- Arts and physical expressions (min. 3h/week),
- Study support (min. 1h30/week).
Similarly to the 1st cycle curriculum, in the 2nd and 3rd cycles there is a minimum amount of minutes allocated to each subject area. The minimum skills and competencies for each grade should be mastered by all pupils by the end of each cycle in order to progress to the next cycle. Additionally, standard rules were created linked to the NC which established that each pupil was required to reach, each school year, specified academic levels (expressed by school marks) in order to be accepted for the next academic level; if pupils had not reached those competencies they would be retained in the same grade (Costa & Rodrigues 1999). A pupil can be retained in the same grade repeatedly more than once until students reach the age limit and leave school (id. 1999, p.82). Grade retention also applies to pupils who exceed the limit of ‘unjustified’ non-attendance at school. While the system of failing and grade retention still exists, there are conditions defined in the Orders 1/2005 and 14/2011 which make it more difficult for teachers to ‘fail’ a pupil. For example children cannot be retained in Year 1 unless they have exceeded the number of allowed absences and the teacher considers it beneficial for the pupil to repeat Year 1. Moreover, if a pupil ‘fails’ in Year 2 or Year 3 he or she should normally follow the class he/she belonged to. In the 2nd and 3rd cycles a pupil will be ‘failed’ if he/she has a final mark below 3 (on a 1 to 5 scale) in Portuguese and Mathematics or three marks below 3 in any subjects. Only 78.2% of the sample of pupils in the 1st cycle have never been retained, and 79.6% of 2nd cycle pupils (OECD 2009).

Portugal has been divided into educational regional authorities since 1981, there are five ‘Directorate-General of School facilities’ [DGEstE], one for each of the five regions of mainland Portugal (North, Centre, Lisbon and Tagus Valley, Alentejo and Algarve). These regional bodies are part of the central Ministry of Education and Science but have ‘administrative autonomy’, and
are part of the governmental policy to increase school autonomy both in terms of organisation and pedagogy (as established in the Decree-Law 266-F/2012). As part of this attempt to increase autonomy, state schools were organised into clusters [Agrupamentos] horizontally or vertically, by geographical area (as described in the Decree-Law 115-A/98).

Schools are grouped into vertical or horizontal clusters. Each cluster of schools shares organisational and administrative structures, and resources. For example each cluster should design an ‘Educational Project’ in which the school is characterised; and in which the school’s values, projects and priorities are identified. Vertical clusters are composed by schools of different levels, which can include early years to secondary schools. Horizontal clusters group schools of the same level, for example three 1st cycle schools that are located in the same district or region. In Portugal schools have little autonomy with only 22% of decisions taken at school level. Furthermore, between 2003 and 2011, decision making in Portugal’s education system became increasingly more centralised: the percentage of decisions taken at the state or central level rose from 50% in 2003 to 74% in 2011’ (OECD 2012b, p.8). The process of teacher placement illustrates this centralised nature as it is mainly done through a national system of application and allocation managed by the Ministry of Education. Teachers indicate specific schools, municipalities or regions they wish to be considered for. They are ranked based on a score composed by the final marks in university degrees and the number of days working as a teacher. Those with higher scores are more likely to be offered a place to teach.

Many teachers and schools adopt a teacher centred approach in which textbooks play a key role. By and large schools select textbooks for each year that all students must buy and some teachers see their role as guiding students through the book. In these cases students who have difficulties in
following what their class is doing, are often presented with activities from other books from previous years or ‘less demanding books’. There is a very strong identity of the ‘class group’ [‘turma’ – the direct translation into English is ‘team’ or ‘gang’]. Pupils are grouped into classes at the beginning of the 1st cycle and tend to stay with that same group during the four years or even throughout the whole compulsory schooling years. As I discussed in Chapter 2, the process of creating ‘classes’ is a complex activity, which not very equitable (Cortesao 1998).

3.2.2 Special and inclusive education and individual planning

The educational system distinguishes three different groups based on the reasons for providing individual planning. These are based on ‘perceived causes of difficulty in accessing the regular curriculum’ (OECD 2005, p.20). However, this distinction is only made implicitly in the policies that determine schools’ responses to pupil’s needs. The OECD differentiates between’ disabilities, difficulties and disadvantages’, whereas in the Portuguese system these categories are not openly stated. The three groups are associated to different types of planning:

- IEPs, CEIs (Individual Specific Curriculum) and transition plans for pupils with special needs and disabilities (defined in the Decree-Law 3/2008)

- Recovery/ catch up plans, follow up/ chaperone plans for pupils with difficulties in learning and, development plans for ‘exceptional’ pupils (defined in the Order 50/2005)
Alternative curricula for pupils at risk of school failure, vulnerability to exclusion, marginalisation and dropping out (defined in the Order 1/2006)

The Decree-Law 3/2008 defines the framework for eligibility and access to specialised support. The target population are pupils with significant limitations at the level of activities and participation due to permanent functioning and structural alterations; these limitations must result in extended difficulties in communication, learning, mobility, autonomy, interpersonal relationships, and social participation. Hence, students identified are expected to have ‘normative’ disabilities (Dyson & Gallannaugh 2008), ‘low frequency, high intensity problems’ (Simeonsson 1994) with biological and intrinsic aetiology. This definition uses a terminology based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (WHO 2001).

The Portuguese educational system is based on a ‘one-track approach’ (OECD 2005), in which all children are expected to attend their local mainstream school and thus special schools should not exist. There are 74 inclusion resource centres that previously worked as special schools, which are expected to develop partnerships with mainstream schools and to provide human and material resources. Most of these are associations for people with disabilities and their families, and education cooperatives (CERCI - Cooperative for the education and rehabilitation of citizens with impairments). There are also a number of mainstream schools called ‘reference schools’, these have extra resources or a special concern for accessibility for pupils with specific disabilities. For this reason they will have more pupils with those disabilities. There are four types of ‘reference schools’:
- reference schools for the bilingual education of deaf pupils,
- reference schools for blind and visually impaired pupils,
- schools with ‘units’ for structured teaching and learning for pupils with ASD,
- schools with ‘units’ of specialised support for the education of pupils with multiple disabilities and congenital deafblind.

Special education teachers play a key role in the schools’ responses to pupils ‘with SEN’. They are organised into three teaching groups: ‘visual disability’, ‘hearing disability’ and other disabilities, namely physical and intellectual.

The role of special education teacher is usually linked to some level of advanced teacher training or Masters degree for early years practitioners and teachers.

Portugal has been considered to be ‘very open to models coming from abroad’ (Costa & Rodrigues 1999) and this Decree-Law (DL) is an example of this as it is built based on the ICF and its Children and Youth version (WHO 2007a) framework. Furthermore, it refers to the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO 1994) with its emphasis on promoting democratic and inclusive schools in which there is an equality of opportunities of access and results.

The DL 3/2008 states that inclusive schools imply ‘individualisation and personalisation of educational strategies with a view to promoting universal competencies which allow autonomy and access to full citizenship to all’.

The responses to pupils under the DL3/2008 include:

- ‘personalised pedagogical support’ which can be done by the early years practitioner, class teacher or special education teacher;
- ‘individual curriculum adaptations’ involve changes to the national curriculum which do not imply that pupils will not achieve the basic competencies of each cycle, they can include offering subjects that are not offered to the mainstream peers (e.g. reading and writing in Braille, sign language) and exempting pupils from certain activities which are difficult because of the pupil’s disability;

- adaptation of the enrolment and assessment processes;

- ‘specific individual curriculum’ [Curriculo especifico individual – CEI] for pupils to whom the national curriculum needs significant alterations, or as it has been translated in the literature ‘highly individualised curriculum’ (Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013). This alternative form of curriculum should lead to the pupil’s personal and social autonomy and should focus on functional activities of the daily life, communication and transition to post-school life. This form of individual curriculum is considered a ‘last resource’ and pupils who have a CEI during years 1 to 9, will attend secondary school (Years 10-12) with a CEI (DL 176/2012).

The DL 3/2008 explains the two phases of access to special education responses: referral and assessment. The referral can be done by the parents or guardians, early intervention services, teachers, other stakeholders who work with the child and who know about the existence of SEN. The right and duty of parents to actively participate in all aspects of the special education responses to their sons or daughters is emphasized.

The second phase is the assessment of the pupils’ ‘needs’. The outcome of the assessment is a technical-pedagogical report, done by the special education teacher(s) and in some cases the psychology services. This report is based on the ICF and identifies the reasons and typology of the pupil’s SEN: ‘health
conditions, diseases or disabilities’. The special education teacher(s) should also determine the special support, support technologies and changes to the teaching and learning process adequate for each pupil. In the case the special education teacher(s) considers the pupil does not have SEN he or she should be referred to other types of support available at the school, usually under the Order 50/2005 which I will explain further down.

Another outcome of the assessment process for pupils ‘with SEN’ is an IEP and/ or Individual transition plan. The IEP is a compulsory document for all pupils with SEN, where the educational responses and forms of assessment are presented and explained. In pre-school and during 1st cycle, the IEPs should be developed by the class teacher, the special education teacher and the parents, and other services as needed (i.e. health centres/ GPs, specialised resource centres and special settings). In the second and third cycles and in secondary school the IEP should be developed by the same key people but instead of ‘the class teacher’ the head of class teacher represents the other teachers.

The different parts of the IEP are stipulated by the DL 3/2008. It must contain:

  a) pupil’s identification,
  b) summary of personal and schooling history,
  c) a functioning profile based on the ICF which has functioning indicators for learning and difficulties
  d) environmental factors that act as facilitators or barriers
  E) adaptations in the teaching and learning process
  F) contents, aims, strategies, human and material resources
  G) levels of participation in school’s educational activities
  H) timetable
I) responsible staff members
J) process of IEP implementation assessment
L) date and signature of participants in IEP design and implementation

Individual transition plans are complementary to IEPs and should be developed for pupils with who will not reach the competencies defined in the curriculum. The transition plan should start being implemented ‘3 years before the end of compulsory schooling age’ with a view to promoting the transition for post-schooling life, and the acquisition of ‘social competencies for integration in the family and the community’ (Ministério da Educação 2008, Art. 14).

The introduction of the ICF in the SEN assessment and in the process of deciding who is ‘entitled’ to special education has been quite controversial and contested by both the academic community and school teachers (Rodrigues & Nogueira 2011; Fórum de Estudos de Educação Inclusiva 2008). Rodrigues and Nogueira (2011) identify two problematic factors: the use of the ICF, a health-based classification, for pedagogic assessment and decisions may not be appropriate. It is seen as a step back in the move away from a medical approach to special needs. Secondly, the changes in the law and the introduction of the ICF were both rushed and poorly researched.

The ICF terminology was used in the DL 3/2008 for the definition of the new target population; a target which the Ministry of Education decided would be less encompassing. Thus, teachers were left to manage alone with pupils who used to be considered ‘SEN’, and from 2008 onwards were not entitled to support from the special education team. This change, which was a political and economic decision, was attributed to ‘the ICF’. Furthermore, the classification is an extremely complex instrument and teachers/ special
education teachers were not offered sufficient training to understand it and use it.

The order 50/2005 (DN 50/2005), concentrates on the use of recovery, follow-up and development plans as part of an intervention strategy to promote the educational achievement of all pupils in Years 1 to 9. It proposes three types of individual plans:

- recovery/ catch up [Planos de recuperacao] which should be created by the class teachers for students with ‘difficulties in learning’;

- follow up/ chaperone [Planos de acompanhamento] for students who have been retained and are repeating a year;

- development [Planos de desenvolvimento] for students with ‘exceptional capacities for learning’.

The DN 50/2005 establishes that mainstream teachers should create plans which should be implemented through differentiated pedagogy and tutoring. These plans and its associated provision must be managed by each school, and mostly by each class teacher. In practice recovery plans are aimed at pupils who have difficulties that are not linked to ‘permanent functioning and structural alterations’, those whose difficulties are not health-related, such as the existence of social and family issues. The Order stipulates that pupils with difficulties in learning need ‘higher quality educational responses’ in mainstream education and not ‘special education measures’ (DGIDC 2008).

The third Order mentioned (DN 1/2006) proposes the use of alternative curricula as part of the ‘continuum of responses to the heterogeneity of situations generated by the universal, free compulsory education’ (Rodrigues
& Nogueira 2011, p.12), these types of curriculum aimed at pupils under 15 years old who:

- ‘failed years repeatedly’,
- have integration problems in the school community,
- are at risk of marginalisation, social exclusion or early school leaving,
- have difficulties that hinder learning, namely strong disinterest, high truancy levels, low self-esteem, lack of expectations of learning and the future, mismatch between school and culture and background culture.

The Decree-Law (176/2012) is known for increasing school attendance age from 9 to 12 years and it mentions ‘alternative curricula’. These are amongst other responses that schools should provide whenever difficulties in learning are detected. This Decree-Law states that ‘measures must be taken to prevent school failure and dropout’. However, it does not specify eligibility criteria for pupils to access those responses. The responses include reinforcement of study support, extra support, temporary creation of relatively homogeneous groups in terms of school attainment in key subjects, in exceptional cases adoption of different paths namely alternative curricula and combined education and training options, referral to vocational training, design of an alternative curriculum by modules for pupils aged 16 or over, and encouraging the pupil and his or her carers to find a school with an educational project that matches the pupil’s interests. The law states that ‘pupils who are in the 2nd or 3rd cycles and have repeated a year twice in the same cycle or three times in total, should be referred to an educational option that matches their interests and abilities’, subject to the agreement of the parent or guardian. The details of how this would work in practice are not clear.
3.2.3 Cultural and historical aspects that influence thinking and procedures around individual planning

The revolution of 25th of April 1974 brought to an end over thirty years of dictatorial government headed by Salazar. This situation left Portugal isolated from the rest of Europe and with a considerable ‘structural delay’ (Rodrigues & Nogueira, 2011). The ‘Carnation Revolution’ in 1974 is still celebrated as it reinstated a democratic regime and brought considerable social change. In 1986 Portugal became a member of the European Community and also in that same year the Basic Education Law 48/86 established the general framework of the Portuguese educational system. It stated that education should be universal, compulsory, free, should last 9 years, from when children where 6 years old to when they turned 15. At the present, all children and young people must be enrolled and attend school from 6 to 18 years old.

The first university degree for special education teachers was created in 1941 and experiments of integrating blind pupils in mainstream schools took place in Lisbon from 1969 (Rodrigues & Nogueira 2011). However, special education was only defined formally in the Law in 1979. Law 66/79 determined that special education should take place in mainstream schools as far as possible and was defined as the ‘group of activities and educational services aimed at children and young people who need a specific response because of their characteristics’, it specified the target population as ‘physical, sensory, intellectual disabled’ [deficientes físicos, motores, orgânicos, sensoriais e intelectuais]. Furthermore, it stated that children and young people with learning difficulties and behaviour problems were not under the responsibility of special education services. It added that schools should gradually readjust their structures and that special education services should provide support as needed. Young people who were not able to
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Attending mainstream schools should be referred to ‘multipurpose workshops’ to receive pre-professional training, to rehabilitation centres and to protected employment. This law referred to special education centres, as autonomous regional bodies constituted by one or more service or school for pupils with disabilities. It also referred to the creation of an institute for special education. Finally, it stated that special education was guided by national policy for rehabilitation of ‘the disabled’.

This was followed by an educational policy of integration in the 1970s and 80s with mobile teams of special education teachers being created. Simultaneously numerous ‘education cooperatives’ (CERCI - Cooperative for the education and rehabilitation of citizens with impairments) were created by parents and technicians who aimed to provide medical and specialised support as well as schooling for pupils with disabilities. These cooperatives took on the role of ‘special schools’. Given the educational policy of full inclusion in mainstream, the CERCI offer early intervention, specialised support to children with disabilities and their families, occupational activities for people with severe intellectual disabilities, professional training, protected employment, residential care, support to families of ‘persons with disabilities’.

The Basic Education Law (Law 48/86) defined special education as part of the general education system, with the existence of support within mainstream schools and special schools, depending on the type and severity of disability. It used the concept of ‘specific education needs’.

The Decree-Law 319/91 was key in the development integration and inclusion practices in mainstream schools as it established the right of children with SEN to be educated in ordinary schools (Costa & Rodrigues 1999) by introducing the framework for adapting teaching and learning.
processes for pupils with SEN within mainstream classes. The openness to models from abroad previously mentioned is also clear and this is reflected in the DL319/91 as it refers to substituting the medically based categorical classification with the concept of ‘pupils with special educational needs’ based on pedagogical criteria. This follows the trend set by the Warnock report (Department for Education and Science 1978). It also uses the Swedish concept of a ‘school for all’ when it mentions that the mainstream schools should be open to pupils with special educational needs and should be responsible for pupils with disabilities and learning difficulties. The DL 319/91 established two official documents: the individual education plan and the educational programme. The individual education plan was applicable for pupils who followed the mainstream curriculum. It was based on the national curriculum and adapted to the level and type of disability. The educational programme should be designed annually for pupils who ‘attended’ special education and had individual or alternative curricula. It consisted of a set of pedagogical procedures aimed at reinforcing the autonomy of pupils with SEN due to physical and intellectual disabilities and it substituted the mainstream curriculum by focusing on ‘learning specific contents’.
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There is limited empirical evidence on how individual planning is used in schools, especially in terms of the impact of the phenomenon of individual on the way pupils and classes are conceptualised, this study aims to study the mechanisms of the construction of difference in education, through the perceived need for individual planning and provision for some students. In view of the aim of understanding processes and underlying assumptions in schools, exploring cultural aspects and system characteristics. This study was designed as comparative case-study research that included schools in two countries. Looking cross-nationally at schools in England and Portugal enables a deeper exploration of issues and assumptions. It also requires concepts which are meaningful and comparable in both countries. Hence, in this study I have used the concept of ‘individual planning’. I have defined individual planning as the existence of a formal plan for educational provision. This plan does not have to be designed for individuals, but it does have to mention individual pupils’ names. The provision must take place on a regular basis and can be delivered individually or to groups of pupils. The specific type of individual planning I am interested in is one that is considered applicable or necessary only for some pupils.

The empirical objectives of the study were formulated through three research questions:

- Who is identified as needing individual planning?
- What forms of individual planning are used in different contexts?
- What interventions and provision do these plans propose?
These questions are underpinned by a broader question: ‘What assumptions about normality and difference can be found in these processes?’

A qualitative approach was considered most appropriate to collect data for the study due to the focus of the study. The research aimed to understand the processes of conceptualisation of and response to diversity in schools. It implied comparing underlying assumptions held by teachers. The use of qualitative methods is common in studies that focus on perceptions and assumptions. This is due to the need for intense contact with a ‘field’ in order to gain a ‘holistic’ overview of the context and capture the insiders’ perspectives through an empathetic understanding (Miles & Huberman 1994, p.6).

Moreover, using qualitative strategies allowed me to deal with ‘complexity, detail [and] context’ (Hantrais & Mangen 2007) that are key to understanding the impact in daily school practices of cultural aspects, system and individual staff characteristics. The meaning of certain school practices has subtle nuances that have to be drawn out (Booth & Ainscow 1998) taking into account complex and often unstated assumptions. For example decisions around what have been defined as the three main types of dilemmas of difference that take place in a school context: identification, curriculum and location dilemmas (Norwich 2008a).

My aim was not to establish what the identified students’ needs were, and whether they were being attended to by schools and teachers. Rather, it was to understand what contextual aspects impacted on the process of those students being identified as different. My research is in line with many aspects of constructivism and social constructionism, as opposed to realist and positivist epistemological approaches. Social constructionism,
traditionally linked to psychology, postulates that ‘the categories with which
human beings apprehend the world do not necessarily refer to real divisions’
(Burr 2003, p.3), that these categories are historically and culturally specific,
depending on particular social and economic arrangements prevailing at that
time (Burr 2003, p.4). For this reason it is important to ‘take a critical stance
toward our taken-for-granted ways of understanding the world’ (Burr 2003,
p.2).

4.1 Research design: a cross-national comparative nested
case study

Given my theoretical orientation, research questions and aims, my methods
of data collection had to be able to capture whether difference is
conceptualised and diversity is responded to differently in different contexts.
For that reason I opted for a case study design, based on a series of linked
case studies, nested at various levels: country (national), cycle (primary/
secondary), school, teacher and child. The study was designed in accordance
with Yin’s (2003; 1984) definition of case study:

   an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary
   phenomenon within its real-life context, in which the boundaries
   between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and in
   which multiple sources of evidence are used’ (Yin 2003, p.23).

The aim was to explore and compare the implications of various contexts,
and the factors in play in those contexts, thus the study was nested at those
various levels.

According to Hantrais and Mangen (2007, p.3) cross-national comparative
research generally aims to explore social phenomena across nations, explain
similarities and differences, and attempt to assess their consequences.
Furthermore, contextualisation plays a key role in cross-national
comparative research and the researcher must develop an in-depth understanding of the socio-cultural, economic and political contexts (Hantrais & Mangen 2007, p.4).

The diagram below (Figure 1) shows that in each country two primary/1st cycle schools were selected, and within each school two year groups (Years 2 and 6 in England and Years 1 and 4 in Portugal) were targeted. The reasons for the choice of these year groups related to two main factors: a similar age and a similar stage in schooling. These factors will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. A maximum of six students was identified by their teachers as needing some form of individual planning and provision. The cases of the selected pupils were then followed during the next academic year (Years 3 and 7 in England and Years 2 and 5 in Portugal). The semi-longitudinal nature of the study was aimed at capturing how the same pupils were described, and responded to over a two-year period. In some cases this involved a change of school from primary to secondary.

Figure 1 - Nested case study design showing the number of students by year group
Working as a qualitative researcher internationally raises three questions. These concern culture, the relationship between the researcher and the researched and the nature of the comparison’ (Stephens 2009, p.25). In light of the concept of culture, it is debatable and debated whether ‘nation’ is an appropriate ‘unit of analysis’, especially given that it is a ‘contested and loaded concept’ (Hantrais & Mangen 2007, pp.7, 8). Additionally, the approach to research using nations as a ‘unit of analysis’ might conceal within-nation variations. Indeed, it is certainly true that in England the variation between regions, Local Authorities, rural and urban environments and even schools is remarkable and hence, a ‘nation’ approach could be problematic. However, in this case, a cross-national approach seems appropriate for two main reasons: on one hand, the existence of a national educational legislation in both countries (e.g. Education Acts in England and Law 3/2008 in Portugal); on the other hand the ‘nation’ is only one of the several layers that will be taken into account in the research design. Other levels such as region and school were also taken into account, avoiding some of the potential dangers of ignoring within-country variation. Additionally, the choice of a societal approach which focuses on the relationship between macro and micro factors and the interaction between a plurality of causal factors that influence social phenomena (Hantrais & Mangen 2007) seemed appropriate in the sense that I would not just focus on trying to find general laws (as in universalist cross-national comparative approaches) nor would I adopt a culturalist approach, trying to find and explain only contrasts and differences between the two countries. A societal approach allowed me to ‘discern regularities and discontinuities across national contexts’ (Artiles et al. 2011, p.6) and aligned with my theoretical orientation in viewing organisations, such as schools, culture bound, dependant on policy, dominant elites and external subcultures. Artiles and Dyson (2005, p.45) proposed a comparative cultural historical framework in which culture is
one of the main dimensions to be taken into account. The authors propose three perspectives of culture: regulative, interpretative and instrumental. The regulative and interpretative perspectives of the cultural dimension helped me when trying to grasp the differences in the ‘models of inclusion’ in use in England and Portugal (regulative perspective) and the interpretive perspective reminded me of the relevance of the teachers’ beliefs, values, expectations and own life histories in making sense of the school contexts around them. The instrumental dimension of culture, implied that what was going on in schools (e.g. the provision/ interventions taking place) could be in itself viewed as a unit of analysis.

Going back to Stephens’ three questions, I have discussed the issue of culture and I will now focus on ‘the nature of the comparison’ (Stephens 2009). Some of the challenges of comparative studies are linked to the units of comparison used. In the case of the fields of special and inclusive education this is intensified by issues of interpretation and translation, incomparability of the terminology used in different countries and also what is understood as the ‘target’ population (D’Alessio & Watkins 2009). The comparative cultural historical framework (Artiles & Dyson 2005) was fundamental in defining the path and details of my data collection. This framework points out several aspects to be taken into account when doing comparative research in inclusive education which are instrumental to avoid the issues of comparability presented by D’Alessio and Watkins (2009) and to avoid an oversimplified view of ‘educational processes and practices’ (Booth & Ainscow 1998).

The comparative cultural historical framework is organised into four main dimensions: Participants, Culture, Temporal/historical, and Outcomes (Artiles & Dyson 2005). The last two dimensions were useful in general when conceptualising my research project, the participant dimension helped me
focus my research questions. It pointed out the need to try and understand which students were identified as needing individual planning. In other words, what was/were the target group(s) in schools in England and Portugal. What ‘groups’ were used by teachers to describe these students, for example was there a ‘more fluid notion of special needs education’, a ‘categorical system of disabilities’ or other demographic information such as socio-economic background, language, ethnicity, religion or gender? (Artiles & Dyson 2005, p.44). In addition, the framework focused on which practitioners were involved and held responsible for responding to student diversity; who would schools indicate as the staff member(s) who knew more about individual pupils’ cases and what would that mean?

### 4.1.1 My role as a researcher

In light of Stephens’ (2009) three questions regarding qualitative researchers working internationally, I will now focus on the relationship between the researcher and the researched. I believe that it is the role (and the right) of parents and parents’ organisations to lobby for the interest of their children; to fight for pupils to be identified and receive appropriate support in the existing educational system. Nonetheless, I think it is the duty of researchers and academia to question what is best for the pupils not only in the existing system but ‘what could be’, to question the education system itself and the rationale and goals behind it. During the duration of this study I set myself the task of identifying ‘more just and empowering’ ways of making sense of learner diversity (Ainscow et al. 2013, p.11).

During my data collection I had ‘complex identity’ and many roles. ‘I was a researcher’ trying to answer my study questions. For this reason I needed access to schools, to teachers and to information. I had to be as thorough as I possibly could, as it was ‘my data’, ‘my PhD’. However, in this role I was an
outsider to the school contexts. I had to respect and be thankful for whatever
time and level of involvement the teachers were prepared to dedicate to ‘my
study’. Even if this meant lowering the quality and thoroughness of the data
collected. Simultaneously, given my background and previous experience, ‘I
was a teacher’ so schools were places where I felt naturally ‘at ease’ chatting
to people who could be ‘colleagues’. However, my identity of ‘other’ was
intensified by the fact that I was conducting interviews in two countries. So,
in English schools I was ‘the Portuguese lady’, in Portugal I was ‘the
colleague who is studying in England’. My identity was complex but this
prismatic reality proved to be advantageous. I was able to conduct
interviews in both languages; I had worked in an English primary school so I
was aware of common practices and structures. And I had trained to be a
teacher in Portugal, but I had not worked in schools in that country for a
number of years. I presented these interviews as conversations in which
practitioners were asked to explain what happened in their school. In other
words, in both countries I asked the participants to share their experiences,
knowledge and possible issues with someone who was not entirely familiar
with what happened in schools in that context. This way, the practitioners
were the experts, and they were empowered. Given my particular situation I
was able to ask very basic, yet complex questions, without it being faced as a
critique of what was being done, either by the teachers themselves or by the
government.

My role as a researcher was also complicated by the fact that I had to
translate words and ideas from one language to the other. The challenge was
present during the fieldwork as well as during the analysis and writing up of
the study. The issue of translation in comparative research has already been
mentioned in the Research design section however, I wanted to add a more
personal note. To this day I still remember the words of my Year 11 Latin
teacher: ‘Traduttore traditore’. This Italian pun means ‘translator traitor’ and this is one of the reasons why I have never enjoyed translating. I always have the feeling that some of the meaning, the connotations, and the subtleties are lost. In this study I am working precisely in an area that deals with complex notions of difference, assumptions and of ‘politically correctness’.

Practitioners in different countries develop distinctive discourses in describing their students, and a literal translation cannot in fact translate from one discourse to another. Words like ‘normal’ when referring to pupils or ‘misadjusted calligraphy’ are terms that no English teacher would use.

The meanings of some words are not fully translatable into English. For example I have translated ‘turma’, ‘Plano de acompanhamento’ and ‘encarregado de educação’ as ‘class group’, ‘Follow up/ chaperone plan’ and ‘carer’. And similarly English words like ‘differentiation’ have an implicit meaning in England, which is linked to the culture of the country and the history of the term.

During the interviews I tried using plain language in both languages. Rather than using terms which could have different meanings for the participants, I used descriptive language, and generic terms that I would discuss with the practitioners. In writing up this thesis for some terms I used literal translations and for others I did a more dynamic translation. Moreover, I opted to include some Portuguese terms in square brackets. The rationale for these choices was that when I, or another Portuguese speaker, would read my English translations, it had to be possible to back-translate to Portuguese without losing the accuracy of the information. The Glossary was also used to help the reader ‘navigate’ the Portuguese terminology.
4.2 Data collection

The fieldwork was conducted over two years, with engagement with schools in England and Portugal as shown in Table 5. Data was gathered following two main approaches: documentary evidence and interviews. This allowed for triangulation as it provided me with two types of data source which referred to the same case. Additionally, by asking teachers to explain the written planning documents it provided me with an extra level of complexity – in most cases they were providing me with a rationale for what had been decided and written on formal planning documents, and this unveiled possible dilemmas and disagreements with existing practices and policies, or even between staff members.

Documentary evidence included national and school policy documents. Examples of national policies are the Decreto-lei 3/2008 and Despacho Normativo 50/2005 - two key Portuguese national legislation documents; and in the case of England documents such as the National Curriculum and the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) green paper. School policy was also taken into account, for example Mission Statements, Internal Rules [Regulamento interno], and reports. A large part of the documentary evidence however, consisted of planning documents, such as individual education plans, individual behaviour plans, differentiated whole class plans, and provision maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>England</strong> Mar; May; July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong> April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong> Jan – Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>England</strong> Apr – July 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Fieldwork: timeframe for data collection
Despite the time-consuming nature of interviews, in terms of planning, the fieldwork itself and transcriptions (Robson 2002), I felt this was the best methods to reach the depth required to explore subtle underlying assumptions and complex mechanisms that impact on the process of constructing and responding to difference in schools. Moreover, the flexible nature of a semi-structured interview meant that I could engage in a conversation with school staff members, to whom I would ask if they could explain to me what was done in their school and why. This ‘informal tone’ coupled with the reassurance that ethical procedures were being followed and that all data would be anonymised made participants feel more confident and less threatened by sharing sometimes quite personal views, and enabling them to share their opinions.

The interviews were always conducted on school premises and all interviews were digitally recorded, with one exception because the teacher did not feel comfortable about being recorded. In that case I took written notes during the interview. Moreover, I switched the recorder off in one occasion when a teacher wanted to tell me something she was worried about being recorded. In a few cases pupils were present in the room where the interview was conducted (e.g. interview with Year 2 teacher at Peacock 1st Cycle School) or could walk past or enter the room (e.g. Year 6 teacher at Eagle Primary School). This meant that in some cases teachers would write part of the information on paper (e.g. a pupil’s name before beginning an oral description of the pupil). This interview arrangement could also have had an impact on how much teachers were able to disclose, since they did not want pupils to hear or understand what they were explaining.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with staff members identified by the school as ‘the people who would know more about the pupils’, this meant people with a variety of roles, namely special educational
needs coordinators, class teachers, teaching assistants, special education
teachers, heads of learning or head of year (in the case of secondary schools). 
In primary schools both class teachers and the SENCOs or special education
teachers were always interviewed.

The interview guide presented in Figure 2 corresponds to the last version used, however, an interview guide was used throughout the two years of study to increase comparability of data collected. This interview guide evolved and was refined in each contact with schools. The trend was to move from a particular focus on ‘IEPs’ to questions around the context (school, class) and individual planning in general. An English version was created based on the study research questions, and an interview conducted as part of the pilot study with the SENCO at Eagle Primary School. This interview was used to check whether the research questions made sense from a ‘school’ viewpoint, I will expand on the usefulness of this pilot study later in this chapter. The English version of the interview guide was then translated into Portuguese. After the first interviews in Portugal, a question was added regarding the use of textbooks. The reason for this was that textbooks appeared to have an impact on teaching and on individual planning.
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Figure 2 - Interview guide

- Briefly describe school
- (staff member) Role in school
- How school organises forms/ classes/ sets
- Describe class where student is
- Describe student(s) and how/if they impact on class planning
- Describe examples of other students with IP
- Describe how school manages planning and provision
  - Group, individual
  - IEP, ILP, provision maps...
- Explain interventions
- Role of textbooks (in Portugal)
- Role of assessment

4.2.1 **Pilot Study**

The pilot study took place at Eagle Primary School in England, where I had collected data for a module during the first semester of my PhD. The research project looked at opportunities and barriers for parental involvement and did not involve any of the teachers whom I interviewed for this study.
During the pilot study I interviewed the SENCO at this school, which allowed me to check whether the research questions I had designed made sense from the school’s point of view. My initial interview guide (See Appendix 1) was very much focused around IEPs, however I soon came to realise that in this school IEPs were only one type of planning document among others. This was crucial to the development of my research questions using a broad concept of ‘individual planning’ which proved to be critical for my study for a number of reasons: it was essential in capturing other types of individual planning used in schools both in England and in Portugal; it increased comparability of the data given that I was using a generic term which did not have a concrete meaning in any of the settings; and it allowed for other groups of pupils to be identified as having individual planning, not only those who had IEPs ‘because of SEN’.

This interview also had an impact, as previously mentioned, on the year groups selected for the study, since the SENCO suggested that ‘the youngest kids had more individual interventions whereas the oldest tended to work more in groups’.

This pilot allowed me to fine-tune the methods of data collection, firstly it reinforced how a digital recorder could be useful in letting me focus on listening to the participants and thinking of the next questions or probes to create a conversational environment. However, this experience also made me think of how the physical presence of the recorder could have an impact on the teachers’ self-perception and on my own. This meant in the following interviews I would not place the recorder in a central position, I would tell the teachers I would switch it on and put it to the side so we could ‘forget about it’. I also realised the importance of taking some time immediately after leaving the school to write some quick notes about essential information (e.g. teachers’ names, pupils’ selected, first feelings and
impressions regarding the school’s procedures). Furthermore, the methods of data analysis were also tested using the data from this interview as it was transcribed and imported into NVivo, where I started creating themes and also reports of word frequency of certain key words. This allowed me to explore in which contexts the most frequent meaningful words were used. For example:

Plan/ Planning
- Differentiating planning
- Individualised plans/ Planned for individually
- Plan for the needs
- Planning for individual needs
- Plan for them
- Plan what we’re doing/ plan what we have to do
- Planning for gifted and talented children
- School improvement plan
- Using [mainstream group] planning to prepare SEN students
- IEP / ILP (individual learning programmes)

As I mentioned this pilot study was extremely used to help me understand the key role of planning in schools and how in the case of this school various types of planning documents were used, including the use of the mainstream lesson plans to manage responses to the pupil’s diverse ‘needs’.

4.2.2 Ethics

The research was conducted in accordance with the University of Manchester research ethics policies. Namely, consent was sought and received from the University Research Ethics Committee (ref 10219).

Prior to starting data collection an information sheet was shared with the potential participants (English version in Appendix 2). Informed consent
forms were produced in English and Portuguese and these were read and signed by all the participants before their involvement in the study. The forms included:

Confirmation that the participant read the information sheet and had the opportunity to discuss possible questions

Confirmation that the participants understood they can withdraw from the study at any time and that the interviews would be audio recorded

Agreement that the data collected could be discussed with the researcher’s supervisors, and that it could be published after being anonymised

Additionally, letters were obtained from the schools (from the SENCO, Head, or principal) to authorise me to visit the school and speak to staff members. I had obtained a CRB certificate to work in schools and I have previous experience of working with vulnerable groups both as a researcher (Alves 2007; Alves 2005) and as a teacher. Although direct contact only involved adult school staff, sensitive and personal data about vulnerable children could have been disclosed during the interviews (e.g. ethnic, family, socio-economic background). This was necessary to access information on how difference was conceptualised and explore underlying aspects that influence decisions and planning for individual provision. Anonymity and confidentiality of all participants was maintained, as all the schools, teachers and pupils were attributed pseudonyms at the beginning of the project and at no point were the original names used in this thesis. In more than one instance teachers were not sure if they could share certain sensitive information with me, in those situations I have always advised the teachers to share only information they were comfortable discussing with me. This meant, for example, not having follow up information on the cases of four pupils who went to Elephant High School and only discussing general
information about the school’s procedures and systems regarding individual planning and provision.

I had extended discussions with practitioners about individual pupils across boundaries, that is, I talked about the pupils identified in the first year with other teachers and teacher assistants, in some cases in different schools. This could potentially have implications on the way these practitioners perceived the pupils discussed. The way I approached this was by explaining to practitioners in the second stage of the study that the pupils had been identified by their teachers because they had some form of individual planning, which was not necessarily associated to having special needs or difficulties. I did not convey information from the first school to the second in terms of how the pupils had been described or what schools had in place, apart from the fact that the cases had been identified as having individual planning. In most cases the pupils identified in the first year of the research still had some form of individual planning in the second year. However, in a few cases teachers described the pupils as not having or needing individualised responses.

Research data was fairly and lawfully processed, used for limited purposes, and will not be kept longer than necessary, it was processed according to participants’ rights (confidential and anonymous), stored in a secure manner, and not transferred to unprotected settings. Appropriate arrangements were made for security of personal information when it was stored, no personal information was sent or received by email. Data and results obtained from the study will only be used in the ways for which consent has been given.
4.2.3 Sample

Selection of schools and access

During the first year of fieldwork two primary schools in each country were recruited in two ways: schools in which I had previously done research in (Eagle Primary School and Pelican cluster of schools) and through the recommendation from academic staff from the University of Manchester and Lisbon Escola Superior de Educação (Eucalyptus and Physalis 1st Cycle School s) who had contact with primary schools due to their roles (linked to teacher training). The initial criteria for selection were schools judged to respond effectively to student diversity and located in different areas: local authorities in England and municipalities in Portugal. The aims of choosing schools different areas was not to create a ‘representative sample’, which according to Thomas (Thomas 2011, p.62) is not relevant to studies with a case study design. The purpose was to make it possible to capture possible variations in policy between local authorities (for example in terms of funding, procedures and services). Upon the first contact with schools the criteria were the existence of pupils with individual plans in place and staff willingness to take part in the research project, in some cases over a 2-year period.

Two year groups were selected in each school and followed over a two year period. The reasons for choosing Years 2 and 6 in England and Years 1 and 4 in Portugal during the first year of the study were:

- to focus on two year groups in each school, allowing within school comparisons without losing the depth expected from a case study design
- to follow pupils over transition,
in the case of England from Key Stage (KS) 1 to KS 2 (Years 2 to 3) and from primary to secondary school (Years 6 to 7)

In Portugal although there is no transition within primary school Year 1 was selected because it has a different status as it is the first year of compulsory schooling (for example pupils cannot be retained in Year 1); then I collected data about the same pupils when they moved to Year 2. The transition between the 1st and 2nd cycles is Year 4 to Year 5. This involves a change of school

• to reach a population of similar ages in both countries (See Table 4, p. 740)

• to collect data at the beginning and end of primary school/ 1st cycle.

The design was informed by findings from the pilot study: there appeared to be a difference in the conceptualisation of students and their difficulties depending on their age, as well as differences in approach to students as they progressed.

Selection of students

The selection of students was done entirely by the teachers, sometimes in collaboration with the SENCO or other teachers. I asked teachers to identify up to 6 pupils in their class who had some form of individual planning; I presented my definition of individual planning and further explained that they should identify pupils who, when they were planning for the whole class, they thought they would have to plan for differently. The pupils selected were then discussed with me. Most of the pupils in Year 1 in Portugal did not have formal plans [IEPs, Recovery plans or follow up plans], and this had to do with general policy guidelines and teachers’
assumptions. In practice the Year 1 teacher at Peacock 1st cycle school selected 2 students whom she had flagged to the special education services for an assessment, and she expected they would be accepted as being eligible for special education support. In the case of the Year 1 at Physalis 1st cycle school, again there were no formal individual plans [IEPs, Recovery plans or follow up plans] but 4 pupils were identified by the teacher. Two of whom were receiving Speech and Language Therapy and so although they did not have a formal plan they were receiving a form of provision which was individualised and different from what was offered to the majority. The other two pupils were working based on plans made for the first months of the academic year for the whole class. They were not ‘able’ to follow the planning for the whole class. The teacher explained she was waiting for Year 2 and for letters from the doctors to be able to request an assessment by the special education teachers.

In some cases it meant that all students with individual planning in a class were included in the study. In other cases, teachers chose students from a ‘maximum variation’ perspective: pupils who had individual planning and provision for different of reasons (e.g. in England: being on School action plus, having a statement, having English as an additional language). Additionally, for practical reasons and especially in the case of Year 6 pupils in England, teachers attempted to select a group who would go to a maximum of three different secondary schools.

During the first year of fieldwork a total of 41 students were identified from 4 primary/ 1st cycle schools (Table 6). During the second year of fieldwork I returned to the same four primary/ 1st cycle schools. Additionally, I followed the older pupils into their secondary/ 2nd cycle schools (6 schools in England and 4 in Portugal). I had access to all but one school (Leonardo’s 2nd cycle school in Portugal), this school was located in a different region and
although when I contacted the school board they encouraged further contact by email, they were not willing to receive me at that stage and did not respond upon email contact.

On the other hand, at Elephant High School in England I was received by the head of learning for Year 7, who told me about how the school responded to student diversity in general but this teacher felt he could not discuss individual student’s information without authorisation from the headteacher. Several attempts were made to contact the headteacher but without success, so I was not able to collect further data on the four pupils who went to Elephant High School.

Of the 41 students identified in the first year of fieldwork, two Year 2 pupils left their primary schools (Andrew and Milos: Eagle and Eucalyptus Primary schools, respectively), one Portuguese Year 4 pupil (Leonardo) moved to a 2nd cycle school to which I did not have access and four Year 6 pupils (James, Siobhan, Lynette and Fatimah) moved to a school where individual pupil cases were not discussed (Elephant High School). Therefore, 34 of the 41 pupils’ cases were followed over a two-year period.

Also, a case was added in the second year of data collection (Barton) because the pupil had joined the school in Year 2 coming from another country and his case generated some interesting comments from the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Number of pupils in Primary Schools, organised by country and year group
4.3 Data analysis

Before starting the data analysis all interviews were transcribed verbatim. I used Microsoft word along with a dictation software (Dragon Dictate) to transcribe the interviews during the first year. And then I used NVivo to transcribe the interviews during the second year of fieldwork. I also NVivo (Versions 7, 8 and 9) to organise the corpus data and analyse the data set. All the transcripts and documents were organised into a nested structure by country, school, year group, and pupil case.

Thematic analysis was the preferred method for this study. As a ‘method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data’ (Braun & Clarke 2006), it seemed an appropriate way to handle and compare the data collected cross-nationally following a societal approach.

A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set’ (Braun & Clarke 2006, p.82).

My research questions were used, on the first instance, as a thematic framework for the data analysis. The first research question (RQ1): ‘Who was identified as needing individual planning?’ was captured by two overarching themes the ‘Explanations offered by teachers’ and the ‘Labels used to describe pupils’. This was at a later stage converted into the overarching theme ‘Criteria and discourses’. The second research question (RQ2: What types of individual planning are used?) generated a theme called ‘Planning’, which included all types of planning described by teachers. From the third research question (RQ3: What interventions are associated with individual planning?) I created the theme ‘Responses associated with individual planning’ which was later renamed ‘Structures and Systems’ to provide a better description of the data.
I did some reading and coding on paper during the process of familiarising myself with the data and also as a way of going through the transcripts more than once and checking whether I would identify the same codes. However, NVivo allowed me to read through the documents and consistently assign initial codes to data extracts (e.g. ‘average’, ‘literacy’). It gave me the possibility to search for key words or phrases that appeared to be relevant (e.g. ‘needs/ necessidades’, ‘family/ família’) and explore how these terms were used across the data set. Furthermore, it facilitated the organisation of codes and themes into what NVivo calls ‘Tree Nodes’, which means that (initial) codes can be grouped under overarching themes (See an example of the tree node structure in Appendix 4).

The analysis was done in a two-phase manner in which a first stage involved within case analysis (data from the English schools, data from the Portuguese schools). During this first single-country analysis I took into account the various levels (pupil and teacher, school, and country). This was followed by a cross-case analysis in which the original languages of the documents/ interviews (English and Portuguese) were used in parallel. I decided not to translate the documents prior to my analysis. I used codes and themes both in English and Portuguese. When there was an overlap of the codes and their meanings, then both versions would be condensed under an English word. In other cases, I did not think the Portuguese codes were meaningful for the English dataset (e.g. words like ‘normal’, or ‘textbooks’). In this case I kept the Portuguese code until I was writing up the case studies.

Additionally, I adopted an iterative process of qualitative data analysis as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) (See Figure 3), which implied a stage of data collection, followed by data reduction, and the creation of data displays, which lead to drawing and verifying conclusions, and finally going
back to the field and collecting more data. So, the data gathered during the
two stages (over two academic years) of fieldwork went through a process of
data reduction, using thematic analysis. Creating data displays was an
important step in helping me make sense of my data. Additionally, the data
displays were also useful to share what I was finding with my supervisors.
This process helped me draw conclusions, which were in turn taken back
into the field and informed further data collection and interactions with
teachers. In the course of this iterative process, I built and tested my
conceptual framework (Figure 8 - The mechanisms of construction of
‘difference’ in mainstream schools: how the processes of conceptualisation
and management of educational difference interact). Other data displays are
also presented in the thesis:

- Table 14 - Matrix of responses to pupil diversity: planning and
  provision in England and Portugal;

- Figure 4 - Ways in which extra support/ interventions can be
delivered: in class or out of class; one to one or in group;

- Figure 9 - Problem-solving approach to pupil diversity:
  conceptualisation and management of difference;

- Appendix 16 - Responses to diversity in the 8 English schools.
A first thematic framework had two main ways of looking at the data (themes): criteria and discourses and structures and systems and developed into the final version which consists of two overarching themes: the conceptualisation of difference (RQ1) and the management of difference (RQs 2 and 3). The conceptualisation includes the ‘definition’ and explanation of problems, which consists of the criteria and discourses presented by practitioners for some pupils ‘needing’ individual planning. The management of difference encompasses the systems and structures involved in the planning and provision for pupils who have some form of individual planning. The final version of this thematic framework is presented in Figure 9 (p. 246).

To present the findings I have organised them by country and have dedicated a chapter to England and one to Portugal. Each of these chapters presents the results using firstly the pupil cases and then the schools as a unit of analysis. This was the best way I found to organise the data of a complex comparative case-study but it is a compromise as obviously themes related to the pupils do not exist independently from the school and so in some cases there was a considerable overlap. Within each country chapter I will start by using vignettes of individual student cases, which should give the reader a more detailed, in depth sense of the data collected and the themes that are present across the vignettes. These case vignettes present the cases of pupils as they were described by school staff to me and school documents. The vignettes are followed by an analysis looking across pupils’ cases with a view to present themes around how difference was conceptualised in schools.
This is followed by a section using the schools as a unit of analysis in which I present a school vignette, again, to illustrate the data collected about each school. I then provide an analysis of the themes across schools in each country. This will focus on schools’ responses to pupil diversity, specifically planning and provision. Finally, I will look across countries, with a view to explore and explain similarities and differences in the themes.
Individual planning and difference in English schools

All English schools have been attributed pseudonyms starting with the letter E. I have called the two primary schools Eagle Primary School and Eucalyptus Primary School as shown in Figure 1 (p. 100). Secondary schools that had pupils from Eagle Primary School also have animal name pseudonyms (Emu, Elephant, and Eel). Schools that received pupils from Eucalyptus Primary School have plant name pseudonyms (Elm, Echinacea, and Elderberry). Tables 7 and 8 show the student pseudonyms, the year group and the school(s) attended during the two years of data collection. For example Anita was in Year 2 at Eagle Primary School in 2009/10 and her case was then followed during 2010/11 when she was in Year 3. Eric was identified when he was in Year 6 (in 2009/10) and his case was followed up in Year 7 at Emu High School. In this chapter I present my analysis of the data from the English pupils and schools involved in the study.

The chapter has two main sections, I will start by drawing on pupil cases as the unit of analysis, in order to tackle the first research question: ‘Who is identified as needing individualised responses?’ In the first section I present four student case vignettes to illustrate the data collected. These are exemplars based on the practitioners’ descriptions, rather than full cases of individual pupils. Out of the 23 pupils identified by practitioners I selected four cases: Anita, Sarah, Eric and Marlee. These particular cases were selected in order to present the case of one pupil from each year group from each of the primary schools. This aim is to describe to a higher level of detail and explore similarities and differences linked to year group and school characteristics. Pupils with different ‘types of need’ were chosen to
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exemplify the teachers’ discourse and reasoning. In Appendix 5 and Appendix 6 I present key words used by the teachers, the teaching assistants and the SENCOs to describe the pupils.

The pupil case vignettes are followed by a section looking across the pupils’ cases and analysing the key themes. The themes are linked to how difference is conceptualised. It examines the labels and descriptions used; it discusses the importance of the notion of average; and identifies the explanations offered for the pupils’ ‘need’ for individual planning and provision.

The second section uses the school as the unit of analysis, aiming to answer the second and third questions: ‘What forms of individual planning are used? And ‘What forms of provision are linked to individual planning?’ In the second section I start by presenting a school vignette. Despite the interesting variations in the ways schools respond to pupil diversity, there was also a considerable overlap about their systems and procedures regarding individual planning. For this reason I selected one school to illustrate the type of data collected and I examine the differences when ‘looking across schools’. The analysis of how schools respond to pupil diversity is organised into two sections: planning and provision.
### Table 7 - Students identified in Eagle Primary School in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eagle Primary School</th>
<th>School attended in 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not part of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faruhk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emu school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elephant school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eel school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8 - Students identified in Eucalyptus Primary School in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eucalyptus Primary School</th>
<th>School attended in 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not part of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elderberry school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Echinacea school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elm school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.1 Pupil case level

5.1.1 Pupil case vignettes

Anita

I will start by presenting the case of Anita, who was in Year 2 at Eagle Primary School in 2009-2010. The data presented in this vignette originates from the teacher interviews and the individual planning documents provided to me by the school. Anita is a 7 year old girl, of Indian ethnicity and Hindi is identified as her home language. Anita’s Year 2 teacher described her as having EAL and as having medical needs linked to her visual impairment:

Anita is medical needs and I just said she was born at 21 weeks, very early so she has detached retinas in both eyes, she has very poor eyesight.

The teacher also implicitly said Anita had difficulties and offered a possible explanation for her difficulties:

And what the lady from visual support thought about is, has it got to the level that, because obviously being as early as she was, there could be more than just her vision… do you know what I mean? Has it got to the stage that she’s learned to her capacity and it’s going to be very difficult to her to catch up with...

In the individual planning documents Anita was conceptualised as:

- ‘Must’ have extra provision in the provision map,
- ‘School Action plus ′ (SAP+), and
- Visual impairment (VI) is listed as her ‘primary need’.

Anita had the following kinds of individual planning: IEP and her name was mentioned in the schools’ provision map. This is a form of individual
planning, which was used at Eagle Primary School. It will be explained in detail in the school vignette (section 5.2.1).

In terms of provision, Anita had a vision support worker who came from the sensory support service every fortnight; the teacher mentioned the decrease of support hours over time and explained that the aim of the support was to teach the school how best to respond to the child characteristics:

So really they are there for us more than they are for Anita, they are there to tell us what we need to do for her.

Because Anita has English had an additional language (EAL) she received extra provision in a small group during assembly time. She was in the lower ability EAL group which had another five pupils with EAL. This was delivered by the EAL teacher:

This is about comprehension but it's also about speaking, it's also about picking up things like... we do the ‘think it, say it, write it, read it’, so they think what they are going to write about, say it out loud...

In Year 3 Anita was still described as having medical/sensory/physical needs, and ‘being lower than where she should be’. She was described in relation to the class and groups where she was based:

she’s the only one in this class who is, more medical, sort of sensory or physical needs, most my other ones are here [in the SEN Register] for cognition and learning.

She’s not someone who really lowers your [target levels] (...) and she doesn’t need someone with her all the time

She’s a little bit lower than where she should be, she does have trouble retaining information, so... That’s the main reason, there’s nothing wrong, it’s just like she’s a little bit dizzy, she’s daydreaming, and always struggling concentrating so... She’s not
miles behind, she’s a little bit lower than where she should be really.

The explanations offered for her difficulties were that she had ‘poor concentration’, and difficulty retaining information. But there was also a new perspective:

She’s very shy, she’s very quiet, quite needy, to be honest, always checking everything’s OK, asking, sometimes asking questions she doesn’t really need to ask, just to get the attention really, I think. If... she’s a sweet little girl, she’s a lovely little girl but, I'd just like to see her develop her confidence a bit a lot more, she’s not very confident.

She has a lot of troubled home life as well, I don't really know the ins and outs of it but, there is no confidence there, (...) she always seems very upset and emotional. I just worry about that side more, because she just seems quite sad sometimes.

In Year 3 Anita had an IEP and her name was mentioned in the school’s provision map. Her IEP broad targets were to ‘continue to build her comprehension skills’ and to ‘continue to develop her confidence and independence’ (See Appendix 8). The visual impairment appeared to only be relevant in terms of ‘Suggested (class) strategies to be used’: reading board to support the book; magnifying glass; adapted rulers; adapted resources; sits in close proximity to the white board.

In terms of provision, Anita continued to have fortnightly visits from the ‘sensory support service lady’ who monitored Anita’s development, made resources and advised the teacher on how to best support the pupil. The table and groups in which Anita worked were often the ‘meaningful unit’ in the Year 3 teacher’s discourse. Anita’s table had extra adult support available in English and Mathematics:

...extra support in English and Maths but she doesn’t have the individual one, she... it’s just that she’s in the groups where they
have extra TA’s support so she can access the help her if she needs it.

The school responded to Anita by placing her in the ‘bottom set’ for English and Mathematics lessons. Within the classroom she was in the ‘middle’ or ‘top table’ and her work was the same as the rest of the pupils on that table but it was differentiated in terms of resources:

And then the work is differentiated according to her ability. She would have the same [activities as the rest] of that table, so... If we’re in a maths lesson in her table, she does the same work. She wouldn’t be on the bottom table, she’d probably more likely be on the middle or the top table. It’s just more differentiated in terms of resources she might use, because it’s visual, so she has like different books and things, and worksheets might be enlarged. And when we do Maths she has a special ruler where markings are clearer and it’s that kind of thing.

Anita also received extra provision outside the classroom in a group called ‘Prior learning’:

She has a prior learning group, in assembly time, it's usually about six in a group (...) to raise her confidence and encourage participation, to put her hand up and things like that. (...) Because we said her concentration is quite poor, and she’ll learn a little bit about what we’re gonna do before we had the lesson, so if we’re doing science electricity, she might, go out for 20 minutes in the morning with a few other children. [To do] sort of a bit of a brief intro and then we’ll do the lesson and she’s got some knowledge so it's not all completely new to her.

The teacher also mentioned that ‘just keeping an eye really and do everything that we can do to tackle that [being upset, sad, and emotional] really’.

**Sarah**

Sarah was in Year 2 at Eucalyptus Primary School in 2009-2010. She was 7 years old and was described by her Year 2 teacher as being white British and
having English as her home language. The teacher explained how Sarah had problems with her development and learning, she ‘was’ School Action Plus and a concerning case, in which the educational psychologist was involved. Sarah’s parents were presented as a major barrier to her achievement at school, because they ‘did not support her at home’ and ‘did not ensure she attended school’:

she's quite concerning because when we've done her tests, cognitive tests for where she's working we found out that her language is now working at 3 years 4 months and she's in class with 6/7 year olds

In terms of responses to Sarah’s difficulties, the class had two teaching assistants most of the time and she was one of the pupils they supported. The teacher mentioned the cognitive tests as a main difference in provision. There was a sense that a lot more would take place when the student started Year 3, following a speech and language assessment.

In Year 3, when the teacher described Sarah and explained the reasons for the planning and provision in place there was a notion of lack of progress and a combination of in-child and environmental factors were mentioned:

... at the moment she's not progressing, she has possibly even regressed from where she was last year. (...) because she just doesn't listen for long enough

because she doesn't retain, because she doesn't come to school much and she doesn't work at home, she doesn't really retain anything

The Year 3 teacher mentioned the outcome of the speech and language assessment, but it did not provide the explanation or the 'solution' for Sarah’s difficulties: 'they say that there's nothing they need to do for her'. So, attendance is presented as Sarah's biggest problem:
her problem is attendance, she's not seen enough, so she's very below, she's below, much below where she should be

She's below average attending, she's like 76% of attendance, and the average is 82%.

The change in levels of support is also offered as a possible explanation for Sarah's difficulties:

[the lack of progress] not to do with... Well [is] slightly to do with the level of support, because last year they had two teaching assistants, so one of them was mainly always with her. And worked with them every afternoon. Whereas obviously we have one TA and she does do work with her three times a week in the afternoons but, she's not got that same level of, of support (...). So that's probably why she is the way she is really.

In terms of different planning and provision Sarah has an IEP, she gets differentiated work in the classroom:

she gets different, much differentiated work, she gets basically what the EAL children get, she gets word banks, picture prompts, closed paragraphs, closed sentences. And she gets to use resources in numeracy, and she gets easier work.

Sarah also works with TAs out of the classroom:

So she goes out with the TA and they do a lot of book talks, like read a book and talk about it to encourage her to talk in sentences (...) she works on remembering, then recalling number bonds to 10 on her own

she also now goes out with my EAL child who's recently come, she goes out with him to see Angela [EAL coordinator/ TA] in the afternoons, it's all about talking really, just getting her to explain her ideas and things

From the quotes above and the information provided by the Year 3 teacher, we can understand that although Sarah is a British girl, she is often grouped with students who have EAL both for planning and provision purposes, as that is the provision (out of those existing in the school) that appears to fit Sarah best.
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Eric

In 2009-2010 Eric was in Year 6 at Eagle Primary School. He was a white British, 11 years old boy, and English was identified as his home language. Eric had an Asperger’s syndrome diagnosis. He joined the Eagle Primary School in Year 6, and this was felt as an increased challenge to practitioners as they did not have the ‘same level of knowledge’. This was related to the way ‘the school’ felt they developed an understanding of the students and how to best respond to their characteristics and needs during the first years of schooling:

Eric’s new to us, we don’t know what suits him yet (Y6 teacher)

Eric joined us in September, [we] didn’t know him, [he] came from (...) Wales. Long way, lived in a very remote [place]..., I think the school had 2 classrooms. He lived in a house and his only neighbour was a lighthouse and he was severely Asperger’s (...), mum and dad separated, dad has got some mental health issues so huge difficulties really. But he’s ... has been fantastic and he’s settled really well (SENCO, Eagle Primary School)

From the SENCO’s description of the student, environmental factors such as family and living conditions seem important to understanding Eric’s difficulties and justifying the need for individual planning and provision.

Additionally, the pupil presented a challenge due to the 'mismatch' between his 'potential' and his actual outcomes:

Eric he’s very bright but to get him to access at his own level and reach his potential, I don’t know if we’ll ever find the actual answer but we’re finding ways for him to do it. And he’s accessing it. The other children, Eric it’s a difficult one, the other children actually accessing at the right level, Eric we are getting there with that.

Eric is processing at a level, his SATs level is about a 5... Eric can’t get himself to write
With regards to planning, Eric had a statement of SEN, an IEP, and his name was mentioned in the school provision map. The statement was presented as directly linked to access to extra human resources:

> But he's got a statement so we're going to be able to employ some extra help for him now (SENCO, Eagle Primary School)

Eric also has an ‘Individual Learning Plan’, which is explained by his Year 6 teacher:

> Every day when he comes to school he has to have an Individual Learning Plan which has nothing necessarily to do with his academic level. It's his way of accessing school, so every day with his support worker or if they’re not here one of us who reads off the scale that has been designed to him and he tells us where he is on his stress level on his chart. So if he tells us that he's at a one or two he's allowed into class. But if he's at any other level, we know we have to put something in place to calm him down before he enters the classroom and he can access the curriculum. And it's hit and miss what can set him off, his bike might be dusty and he'll have a bad day so it can be anything but that's in place.

According to the Year 6 teacher his IEP has more to do with strategies to be used with and by Eric, rather than targets for him to achieve, the teacher justifies this by the complexity of the pupil’s needs and presents very clearly how planning for this pupil can be very hard:

> He's got a huge IEP he's got a, his is so general: all the different strategies that we will follow to make sure that he can access. (...) his needs are so complex, it [the IEP] won't say things as bluntly as, needs to learn to use time markers, it's more coping strategies for Eric, so his is more about him actually being involved in a whole class situation.

Flexibility is presented as a key feature when responding to Eric:

> I don't pre-plan it because it depends on how the week is going: good week might be able to use the normal differentiation, bad week have to come up with methods to use.
A lot of planning and a lot of discussion with his support worker on what that day is going like, a lot of flexibility to be honest because you can plan, with Eric you could plan for ever and not get the right (...) you cannot really pre-plan for, you have got your strategies written down in his IEP but it so depends on where he puts himself on the scale that day

This is also linked to an attitude of acceptance of his differences/characteristics:

If Eric would kick the table, he wouldn't be put in a consequence because that's not him being naughty, it's getting his frustrations out, just had to be flexible with that. (...) we all [other pupils in the class and teacher] accept everybody's different needs and Eric's' might not be obvious because you can't see it but we accept it and we deal with it, and we ignore it, and it's the teachers' responsibility, and again he is just part of our class now, that's the way it is!

In terms of provision the school has put a range of individualised measures in place for Eric:

- has access to a computer in some of the lessons (because 'he gets the real hung up about his handwriting, if the letters are a bit too long or a bit too short that can lose him that lesson');
- has a home-school diary where both the teacher and Eric's mother write ('informal things' such as which socks he should/should not wear because 'he's got a real problem with his socks, he can't wear certain socks');
- has a TA assigned to him (initially full-time and later for 20-25 hours a week);
- gets differentiated work in class and during assembly time (he is shown what activity he will do that day, communication groups).
- has an area where he can go when he is not coping with being in the classroom.

So, in Eric's case there is a clear sense of a developing body of knowledge about the student as an individual (and what 'works' for him) and that a lot of the measures, which are only relevant and applicable to him (both in
terms of planning and provision) undergo considerable change throughout the academic year.

In Year 7 Eric transitioned to Emu secondary school. In this school two teaching assistants were identified by the SENCo as the right people for me to interview because they would know more about Eric. However, even the TAs appeared to have difficulties understanding his behaviour, and knowing what to expect from him:

TA1: You think you know him one day, and he just surprises you

TA2: He might be half an hour smiling and chirpy and then something goes [the] wrong way he and he's just... ‘Can't talk to you!'

TA1: He really does scream, screams so loud, he bangs his head on the table, and he'll go like this with his pen or is ruler, or he has a rubber that he [stretches] does that, or he'll kick you, if you stand against somebody he'll kick against the wall, he split his nail yesterday because of banging and crashing and...

TA1: You just learn something new about him every day.

TA2: ...and even that, he’s not consistent

The TAs described Eric as being ‘very very very very particular’, ‘getting cross’ easily when trying to draw, when he feels he cannot keep up with the work, or when ‘he can't, get the computer to do... what he wants it to do, to his standards’. The TAs also commented on Eric’s difficulty to cope with tests and his constant dissatisfaction with his own work:

TA1: He just thinks tests, he thinks tests are there to make him look stupid, that’s his top thing isn’t it? But he’s very very hard on himself (...) he’s got very very very, highest standards, and he never feels he ever achieves them...

TA2: But he does achieve them, he achieves them above and beyond a lot of the kids in year seven.
TA1: But he thinks he was way behind everybody else, and I said no, you’re not, you know, you just take longer to get there...

TA2: And I think that also comes from if he has to be withdrawn from in-class, like if he is finding it, really struggling, like the way he reacts is quite disruptive so we have to remove him from the classroom, and come down here to do the work, so I think he thinks he’s behind because he’s missed half of the lesson, so I think that could also be on his mind where it comes from.

From the quote above it was clear how TA2 thought that withdrawing Eric from the mainstream classroom was having a negative impact on his self-concept and self-esteem. Eric attended a mainstream secondary school and was ‘in a normal form, (...) and he had lessons with all his form’, however he did not go to three subjects: art, music (‘he doesn’t work in groups, and he doesn’t like the noise, he doesn’t particularly like music’) and enquiry skills (ES):

I have him for all those lessons [art, music, ES], and we use it to catch up, or just talk, or he reads, that’s what we do in those lessons, and sometimes just timeout as well... because sometimes... it really depends on his moods and how is like. He can occasionally draw without a ruler but it has to be a very calm day (TA1, Emu school)

In terms of planning documents, Eric had an IEP (See Appendix 10). This stated that his needs were linked to ‘communication and interaction’ and described him as ‘intelligent, with broad vocabulary, good cognitive abilities, reading and spelling ages in excess of his chronological age, accurately uses mental methods in maths’. The IEP also listed a number of aspects in which Eric had difficulties:

- to understand what he has read, to understand the concept of making notes, drawing mind maps, similies, having opinions, choices, feelings and open ended questions,
- difficulties of rule based behaviours and routines which he imposes on himself,
- when anxious or unsure he can display problems with speaking,
- cannot easily work in a group situation.

In terms of provision, Eric worked mainly with the TAs assigned to him, both in and outside the classroom. According to TA1, 'he doesn't really participate in group work so, if the teacher says work with somebody else he will want to work with me or on his own'. Both the IEP and the TAs portrayed a clear sense that Eric 'had to have support in every lesson'. Indeed, his IEP, which listed what needed to be done by the school, focused mainly on human resources with an underlying concern about the pupil’s potential:

- high level of support to ensure he understands instructions and work requirements
- give enough time and support so that he can reach his potential and access the KS3 curriculum at an appropriate level commensurate with his intelligence

Eric attended a social circle:

Oh yeah, he comes down here for what is called social, social circle, where a variety of children that have been identified... who are not very social, don't have many friends, and tend to stand on the outside of things are going on, and are very quiet. They get them together and the actual needs teacher does sort of games and activities. And that's once each week.

The IEP also inventoried numerous specific school responses, here are some of the main aspects:

- use the 'traffic light system' (to 'guide' Eric when he may need to leave the classroom),
- provide a visual timetable of the events that will take place in each lesson,
- give print outs of text that is copied from the board by other students (e.g. homework),
- provide frameworks and differentiate quantity of written work,
- TA can scribe 'at certain times',
- write a social story before forth coming events,
- praise him continually (to raise his self-esteem),
- home-school book,
- 'quiet place in the Learning Support Base for Eric when he feels stressed, needs space or other students become too distracted by his noise level'.

Similarly to his Primary school, the secondary school had certain responses which appeared to be quite personalised (such as time with a special needs teacher to talk about various things, where he’s reading *The curious incident of the dog in the night*). And more functional responses such as TA support during lunchtime as he struggles to cope with the canteen environment.

**Marlee**

Marlee was a Year 6 student at Eucalyptus Primary School in 2009-2010. Marlee, was a ‘recent arrival from Germany’ with German as her home language. She was described in a very positive way: an ‘intelligent, fast learner, working at an average level’. The description was done through comparison with her peers and specifically with other students with EAL:

> The last two girls, we chose because they’re..., they have EAL, Marlee her first language is German, she joined this year (...).

> ... she’s always working at an average level, it’s incredible how fast she's picked, she's picked everything up, and I think she's quite
gifted and will probably overtake some of her peers, in the near future.

So what’s interesting with the two girls [with EAL] is... You can see that Marlee is perhaps more intelligent... or a faster learner, because she now has overtaken Nadia in terms of speaking in English, writing and her understanding. So it makes you wonder... Why?

In terms of planning, Marlee was mentioned in the whole class Short Term plan (See Appendix 12).

Regarding provision, she was receiving extra adult support within and outside the classroom. For example in a writing session: 'DA to support Marlee/Aaliyah'. Outside the classroom she did extra work with the EAL coordinator in a group with other children with EAL.

In Year 7 Marlee transitioned to Elderberry High School, where she was still described in a very positive way and as 'being' EAL:

And then there is Marlee, our little star, Marlee is English as a second language.

But other than that she’s a star, she’s got 100% attendance, never misses school, she’s always here whether she’s sick, whether she’s poorly

The Head of Year 7 showed high expectations of the student and she explained Marlee’s difficulties through her EAL status:

I said ‘Marlee there is nothing to be ashamed of, English is your second language, you can read very well (......). So at the end of the day if I move you to this set now, you will learn and you’ll catch up what you need to do, come next year, even if it takes you another year to be in that class it doesn’t matter, because you want to learn’. She wants to learn so much, and [her] father and mother very, very supportive, always asking for extra work... if she struggles this year and maybe she struggles next year, but because
of the support she will have she will end up achieving greatly I think.

I know her Maths is very weak, but again it's the English, the way they word it in the Maths, so... Fingers crossed, she might have to spend maybe another couple of months, maybe next year, in a class [because she] needs help and support but after that she'll be fine I think.

In terms of provision, Marlee was initially put in a 'mixed ability class' but she was then moved to another (lower) set. This set had extra staff (a teaching assistant) in some but not all the lessons. And the information was presented to pupils in a mix of theoretical and practical ways and activities are guided by the teacher. The decision to move the student was made by the Head of Year 7 with the expectation that with the extra support provided in this set the pupil would 'catch up':

What I do every so often I ask the staff, do you think there's anybody struggling, anybody who needs help, and they said 'yes we think Marlee is struggling'.

I mean sometimes it does work [when I put them in the higher set] and sometimes they will be fine, but no, not in her case, it was most her teachers were saying that she would benefit from moving so I moved her

Marlee did not want to be moved to the other set as she perceived it as a negative change:

she said 'are you moving me because I'm, you know... I'm thick', and I said 'no, I'm moving you because English is your second language, and it's not fair'
5.1.2 **Looking across pupils’ cases: conceptualising difference**

‘Differences are amazing, it can be academic, it can be English as a second language, it can be that they have some form of SEN, we’re talking on the spectrum, on the autistic spectrum, so they do have a statement, if they don’t have a statement, sometimes they come from primary schools and they’ve noticed that numeracy and literacy is not strong so they put them on school action plan, if they think there is more help needed school action plus’ (Head of Year 7, Elderberry High School)

The quote above summarises quite well the broad categories of difference that teachers thought of when they were asked ‘So who is different and in need of something different from or additional to what is provided to the majority of pupils?’. I will now look across the pupils’ cases and refer back to examples not only from the case vignettes presented above but from the all the 23 pupils identified in schools in England.

Pupils identified as having some form of individual planning and as receiving something different from or additional to what was proposed to the majority were usually described using a variety of labels, that can be sorted under three main groups: ability related descriptions (above average, average, below average, lower set, top set, booster child), and SEN related descriptions (medical needs, behaviour issues, school action, school action plus), language status descriptions (EAL). The descriptions were closely linked to teacher expectations and experience. When pupils did not ‘progress’ in line with the expectations, teachers tried to understand and explain the reasons for those difficulties.

**Ability and average**

In England, theoretically placing the students in the continuum of ‘average’ with regards to their perceived ability appears to be a ‘politically correct’
way to construct the students’ differences. The continuum of perceived ability: being below average, slightly below average, just below average, average or above average is commonly used to describe both students and classes/sets. It is linked to notions of age-appropriateness, ability, levels and expectations. Alongside ‘average’, teachers use ‘expected’ as in ‘expected progress’. ‘Intelligence’ was only mentioned by the Year 6 at Eucalyptus Primary School teacher when comparing Marlee and Nadia but ability or capacity was a common way to describe students. For example when the Year 2 teacher at Eagle Primary School reported wondering if ‘[Anita had] learnt to her capacity’, or the head of Year 7 at Elderberry school said that Sharon would ‘never be a top set child’.

In talking about the continuum of ‘ability’, teachers were also able to draw on National Curriculum (NC) levels as more fine-grained way of identifying children’s positions than the ‘average, below- average, above average’ categorisation. Indeed, most of the teachers referred to the levels the students were working at. Despite the fact that not all schools must follow the national curriculum, there are standards of achievement in each subject for pupils aged 5 to 14. For most subjects, at the time of the fieldwork these standards ranged from Levels 1 to 8 and pupils are expected to progress up the levels as they get older and learn more:

- most 7 year olds are expected to achieve Level 2
- most 11 year olds are expected to achieve Level 4
- most 14 year olds are expected to achieve Levels 5 or 6 (DfE n.d.)

These levels were especially referred to by teachers in secondary schools when explaining how forms and sets were organised.
Maggie (Year 2 and 3), Malik (Year 6) and Fatimah (Year 6) were described as being above average. Maggie’s Year 2 teacher thought she was ‘gifted and talented’, and Malik’s assessments in Year 7 (11/12 years old) showed his reading age was 15.3 and his spelling age was 12+. When planning for these pupils, teachers would generally consider them as part of the ‘above average’ group and only in a small number of situations or activities would their names be mentioned individually in planning documents. In most cases this group of pupils was catered for through the level of differentiation expected from teachers when planning for the whole class. In some cases this was associated with extension activities.

At Eagle Primary School ‘being below average’ was associated to being conceptualised as ‘a booster child’, probably linked to the idea of needing ‘a boost’ to ‘catch up with their peers’ and the intervention groups offered at the school:

he’s what you call a booster child, (...) just below average but it’s not because he’s special needs, it’s because of his English but if you’d speak to him now you wouldn’t really notice that he’s got English as a second language (Eagle school, SENCO)

Siobhan and Lynette (Year 6) were also described as ‘booster children’ and the explanations offered for their difficulties were linked to issues of attendance, ‘gaps in learning’ and self-confidence. See the Year 6’s teacher description of Siobhan:

Siobhan isn’t on the SEN [register] but she’s really below-average and there were issues of attendance. (...) she would not be reaching her potential without those groups. she would be underachieving, she wouldn’t, she’d probably be on the special educational needs register without that because she would stand out as being very poor, but her intervention groups are keeping her up with her peers really, and without it she would definitely not be progressing (Eagle school, Year 6 teacher)
This was also linked to an implicit notion of what ‘is’ and ‘is not’ SEN, coupled with the teachers’ expectations of levels to be achieved by pupils:

...those who are SEN or below average [we work] to push them to be average (Eagle primary, Year 2 teacher)

Now I’ve only got 2 children that are below where they should be, and these are the two SEN, that’s it. So, which is children that obviously are going to go through school with special needs and we have to help them achieve different low level targets (Eucalyptus primary, Y2 teacher)

Even though in England pupils from the same year work towards different levels and targets, the notion of average was extremely relevant in the teacher’s discourse. Being 'below average' was considered a warning sign for SEN, and sometimes linked to pupils with 'gaps in their knowledge'. Moreover, being below average and 'having gaps in knowledge' were linked to 'poor attendance' (as in the case of Sarah from Eucalyptus Primary School whose attendance was 76% and was the explanation for her difficulties).

**SEN**

In the eight schools that took part in the study one of the key groups of pupils identified as having individual planning and provision were the students listed in the SEN Register (An example of SEN Register is provided in Appendix 14).

The pupils were included in the SEN category due to 'cognition and learning issues' (Eucalyptus Primary, SENCO). In most cases the learning issues were conceptualised as within-child factors. Examples of these were ‘having medical or physical needs’ like Anita and Farukh; ‘having selective mutism’, an anxiety disorder presented by Xiu who could speak but would not do it; having 'a numeracy problem' as Rita; or having ‘behaviour problems’ like Andrew (who was later diagnosed as being on the Autistic spectrum), Sadaf,
James and Vern. The Eucalyptus Primary School SENCO explained why behaviour problems were part of the SEN concept:

Behaviour is seen as a special educational need because it is an extra need, it’s something that’s preventing them from learning and needs to be dealt with. So behaviour management is all part of the SEN arena.

SEN could also be related to other extrinsic factors that impact on the pupil’s learning, such as ‘having gaps in their learning’ due to poor attendance (Eagle Primary, Y6 teacher), or having ‘family issues’ that impacted on the students’ learning. Behaviour issues were often linked by teachers to family issues. For example, in Year 7 Vern had ‘behaviour, attendance and punctuality problems’ and had been excluded from school ‘for fighting’, this was explained by the lack of ‘family support’.

The crucial factor that determined whether a student was perceived as needing individualised responses linked to ‘having SEN’, were the difficulties in learning, regardless of the reasons causing that difficulty.

The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) was not mentioned by any teachers, unless I specifically asked about it. The general perception was that it was not necessarily relevant in terms of class planning, and it was not seen as individual planning. The CAF was linked to either ‘vulnerable’ children (e.g. children in care) or more commonly ‘CAF families’. For example, at Eucalyptus Primary School the SENCO referred to ‘three sisters that come in half past nine, quarter to ten every morning, you know, no breakfast, dirty, half asleep’. This group of pupils would not necessarily come up as needing individual planning because, as the Year 6 teacher at Eucalyptus Primary School explained:

In terms of planning academic lessons, no [they do not need anything different], it’s more of a social issue that you need to be aware of... Luckily it doesn’t seem to impact on their learning a
great deal, we don’t know what the children are thinking really. If they’re kept as busy as possible, often I think the mind is taken off anything that might be going on at home.

In other words, a pupil who was considered vulnerable because of being in care did not necessarily have individual planning in place if that vulnerability did not impact on his or her learning. Learning in this case means achieving similar grades as the peers, or reaching the levels expected by the teachers.

Moreover, having a disability did not necessarily imply being conceptualised as different and perceived as in need of individualised planning. For example, at Eagle Primary School a student with a hearing impairment (who had a support worker attached) was not identified by her Year 6 teacher for this study, when asked specifically about that student the teacher said:

She’s got hearing aids, and can hardly hear anything we have to have radio mics in class for her. She’s on top set for everything and a support worker in and it does not interfere, not now. Because in all of our rooms we’ve got radio mics, so she can hear it as it is happening. So it doesn’t affect her. We have to be aware of it obviously. (Eagle Primary School, Year 6 teacher)

The SEN group was subdivided by teachers into three: students on School Action (SA), students on School Action Plus (SAP or SA+) and students with Statements of SEN. For example, Faruhk and Vern had statements of SEN; Hazel was on SA+ on both years of my research; Xiu was only when she was in Year 2; and Sharon only in Year 7.

’Being school action’ or ’he’s a school action plus child’ were common ways of conceptualising students who had individual planning, actually, this 3-level system (SA, SA+, Stat) brought to schools by the 2002 code of practice was the most used way for teachers to refer to the pupils to start with, and in most cases this ‘label’ was followed by an explanation of why that pupil was SA/SA+. The three broad categories (SA, SA+, Statement) were used when
reporting back to authorities, alongside with more specific and descriptive categories such as MLD (moderate learning difficulties), SEBD (social, emotional and behaviour difficulties), and ASD (autistic spectrum disorder). An example of the full list of these categories that were in use at Eagle primary and Echinacea College are presented in Table 9.

Although there is a considerable overlap in the categories used, there are some minor differences such as the fact that the categories were grouped into four main areas at Echinacea College, and the existence of an ‘Other’ category at Eagle Primary School. These differences could be influenced by the fact that these schools were located in two different Local Authorities. Teachers at Eucalyptus Primary School, made an interesting use of the SEN concept in the sense of meaning ‘having difficulties’ as they referred to pupils being ‘SEN in literacy and numeracy’ (Stuart and Sharon, Rita).

Only the SENCO at Eagle Primary School (see quote below) and two teachers, one from this same primary school and one from Eel High School used the phrase 'additional needs'. However, it is unclear if they use it as an alternative to SEN, whether it bears a different meaning to them, like 'he needs more than his peers'; or if it could be linked to changes in educational policy and terminology used in Scotland.

'there isn’t a label for that child, they just have additional needs and they are not progressing as an average child' (SENCO, Eagle Primary School)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of need</th>
<th>Categories extracted from a Report to the governing body at Eagle Primary School</th>
<th>Categories extracted from the SEN &amp; Disabilities register at Echinacea College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPLD (dyslexia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound and multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEB (behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/ social communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sensory impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD (physical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD (autistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognition and learning needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulty (SpLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Learning Difficulty (MLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning Difficulty (SLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulty (PMLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour, emotional and social development needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour, emotional and social difficulty (BESD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and interaction needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech, language and communication needs (SLCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensory and/ or Physical needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment (VI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment (HI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sensory impairment (MSI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability (PD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Categories and labels used in school documents – example from two schools: a Report to the Governing Body at Eagle Primary and the Echinacea College Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Register

Consistently with the definition of SEN in the Code of Practice (DfES 2001), the teachers appeared to have an implicit notion of what was and was not SEN, for example when the Year 6 teacher from Eagle Primary School says [Lynette] she's border on the special educational needs but she's not quite there'. SEN is linked to 'not doing something like the others', 'being behind' and consequently 'needing to catch up'. So, if we consider 'being behind in their learning' we are implicitly comparing to other students and desired or desirable levels. Also, the idea of ‘catching up’ demonstrates an underlying notion that pupils were expected to reach the same levels as the majority but were ‘just running behind’. The comparative process also plays a key role when dealing with students with EAL, and distinguishing between EAL and SEN.
Marlee, Victoria, Olene and Nadia were selected by their teachers because of having EAL. The process of telling whether a pupil ‘is behind’ because of having English as an additional language (EAL) or because of ‘having SEN’ is interesting in two ways, on one hand, the existence of these two ‘categories’ that come attached to the possibility of the school putting some extra resources in place, somehow force schools and teachers to decide when faced with a student who is struggling to learn (especially in literacy and numeracy) whether the cause of the difficulties is linked to language difficulties alone or to other reasons, even if the outcome of this process does not necessarily lead to different responses (e.g. phonics intervention programme, reading recovery). On the other hand, it is also revealing in terms of showing the implicit expectations that teachers base their work on. When a child comes to school with EAL the teachers expect an adaptation period in which the child ‘is behind’ due to language issues; so for example Victoria, in Year 2 was getting extra English support since she had recently arrived from Germany, when I interviewed her Year 3 teachers she reported that Victoria was ‘integrated into Year 3 without any additional needs…, she’s actually excelling’. When there was no progress, or very little progress after a certain period of time (that other children with EAL have needed to learn English), then the teachers assumed that those difficulties were not due to language issues and thus must be SEN, as it was clearly explained by the SENCO at Eucalyptus Primary School:

... when the children have come and English is new to them, especially those who come from another country straight away, this is their first country so we give them a settling period, and we know now because we’ve got the experience, we know where they should be up to, we know they should’ve learnt the colours or they should know this, or they should be doing this by now, and that’s when the teacher will come to me and say, hang on a
minute, I think this could be more than EAL, I think this is SEN as well. (...) it is very difficult, we... the school has got an assessment, the tracking system but we also have an EAL assessment so the children are assessed when they first come using the NACI steps, they're assessed in speaking, listening, reading and writing and they're graded, using that descriptors so the teacher assess them when they first come in and at the various assessment points they assess them again so in answer to your question, how I would know is, there is no progress. So it's just, or it's very little, that's when we think might, that's when I would get the psychologist in and say can you do the assessment but that's very difficult because a lot of the tests you have to speak to the children so I've actually sat here when there's been an interpreter, interpreting for the psychologist but then that's not been very successful because the interpreter in the own language, you don't know if they're telling them what to do or, there's, they've not been very successful I don't think so, it's still very much a grey area that we're trying to develop and get eyes around but there are various assessments out there that we can do and tools we can use to try and get deeper into the problem. (Eucalyptus primary SENCO)

So, when pupils do not learn at the 'expected' pace, then it is hypothesised that it is SEN. In this case SEN is associated with lower ability or as shown in a quote by the Year 6 teacher at Eucalyptus Primary School 'less intelligence'.

The last two girls, we chose because they're... they have EAL, Marlee her first language is German, she joined this year, and Nadia’s first language is Polish and she joined at the beginning of year four. So what’s interesting with the two girls is... You can see that Marlee is perhaps more intelligent... or a faster learner, because she now has overtaken Nadia in terms of speaking in English, writing and her understanding. So it makes you wonder... Why? (Eucalyptus primary, Year 6 teacher)

Fatimah was an example of how labels often overlap since she was included in the ‘above average’ group while also being described as having EAL. This illustrates how pupils with EAL may be working at different ‘levels’ of English, and hence the limitations of the meaning attributed to that label.
example pupils who recently arrived from another country with little or no knowledge of the English language and culture, as it was the case of Milos, Victoria and Marlee were hardly in the same situation of Fatimah who, despite Bengali being listed as the language spoken at home, was born in England. On the other hand, it is common for pupils to ‘fit’ various ‘descriptions’, namely an overlap of being considered to have EAL and SEN. Additionally, in cases like Sarah, whose case vignette I presented before, although she was ‘classed’ as ‘white British’ and her home language was English, given her perceived language difficulties she received interventions with ‘the EAL pupils’.

**Same pupil, different conceptualisations**

Quite often, the transition from primary to secondary seemed to change how students were perceived. For example Malik, was identified by his Year 6 teacher at Eucalyptus Primary School as being above average and in the gifted and talented group, however, when followed up in Year 7, the student was not seen as above average or gifted and talented, he was in the ‘higher set’, where he was ‘well integrated’.

Lynn and Malik are in the high... yeah, working above the average in the class. (...) If we’re planning to a level four, with some elements of level five, these children should be working at level five across the board so some of the questions and the tasks if they were planned at an average level, it would be too easy for them, it would be pointless in them being in the room and doing the tasks again because they can do them. (Eucalyptus primary, Year 6 teacher)

He’s great, he’s good mannered, he’s very polite. In science he’s one of the pupils who gets involved quite a lot, when he’s asked to do some group work he integrates well. There’s not much more a can say really, he’s just a really well-mannered pupil. (Echinacea College, Year 7 science teacher)
Another example of this are Stuart and Sharon who were both identified by their Year 6 teacher at Eucalyptus Primary School as being on school action, and they were described as very similar pupils, with difficulties in literacy and numeracy:

Stuart and Sharon have been on IEP throughout the school, really, they were identified at a young age as having special educational needs in literacy and numeracy. (…) they’re both on school action (Eucalyptus Primary, Year 6 teacher)

Yeah, I think that as children come up to us [Year 6], children like Sharon and Stuart are low attainers and they find learning difficult so, I think, the more has been put in place the better, but, it’s unlikely that they’ll ever be working at an average level, within the class, all the time. They can cope with most, most of the things in the lesson but not everything; they’re just not able enough. (Eucalyptus Primary School, Year 6 teacher)

The same two students were then described by the head of Year 7 at Elderberry High School, Sharon is on school action plus and in the SEN class; Stuart on the other hand is not on the SEN register, is in one of the 'more academic' classes without extra support but he spends some time on the Learning Support Unit (LSU) four days a week:

[Sharon] she will never be a top set child, but if we can get there through school and find her a career that will suit her, that will be an achievement from us because there’s no high achieving people in her family.

So we have made sure that when she’s come here, as soon as I saw the levels, yep she’s to go into that class and we need to look after her. A lovely girl, but again family background influences… She’s a type of girl that if we’re not careful we can see her dropping out of school or coming to school less, but again she’s done really well because of the support we’ve put in place. (…) I decided straightaway that she would have sunk in a different class, she wouldn’t have been able to access the curriculum, engage with everyone
Academically [Stuart] he’s middle, but he needs a pushing, it certainly needs a pushing because at home he doesn’t get told that, you know, it’s good to succeed and stuff, he is a type of child that could go one of two ways (...) because to me he is a type of child who cannot do the six lessons a day, and get through that day. Not because I think he’s naughty but, I think as concentration will start going

Stuart for example, he’s not so much literacy or numeracy it’s because of the background of the family it’s the emotional, (...) it’s all the other aspects, it’s the SEAL stuff, it’s the social and emotional aspects of learning

So these two pupils, previously considered similar, created different expectations and responses in their secondary school. Also, the family was perceived in a quite positive way by the primary school teacher, whereas it was pointed as problematic and a reason for some of the difficulties shown by both pupils in High School. These differences do not seem to be explained by differences in school phase or local authority.

But it is not only the transition from primary to secondary school that changes how pupils are perceived, the change of teacher within the same school and possibly also the change in context and expectations can have the same effect. Pupils in the schools that took part in this study had regular contact with many members of school staff from primary school. The presence of teaching assistants who supported pupils in class and delivered interventions outside of class, along with the reorganisation of the class group for certain lessons (e.g. sets for literacy and numeracy with different teachers) made it so that pupils could be perceived differently by those different staff members. For example when referring to Anita from Eagle Primary School, whose case I presented earlier, her Year 2 teacher mentioned that she will not catch up, that maybe she reached her capacity and that it is not ‘just’ her vision. Whereas, her Year 3 teacher said she was ‘not the worst in the set’, that ‘there is nothing wrong with her’, that ‘she is just shy and
needy’. Victoria is another example of how different teachers have differing perceptions of the same pupil:

she’s excelling. She’s doing incredibly well, her language has caught up (Teacher C, Eagle, Year 3)

there still are issues with her language in literacy, because... what she gets [wrong] is mainly tenses, and just word order, and things...... but she’s doing fine, she is in the top group in my, my set [lower set], and she’s doing fine. (Teacher H, Eagle, Year 3)
Chapter 5: Individual planning in English schools

5.2 School level

5.2.1 School vignette: Eagle Primary School

I will present a brief characterisation of the school population and move on to describe systems and procedures linked to individual planning and responding to pupil diversity.

The school is of an above average size for primary schools nationally with an enrolment of 350 pupils. It serves an area of rented property and private housing situated in an inner city suburb of a major city in the north west of England. The proportion of pupils with learning difficulties and/or disabilities is above average and so is the number of pupils who receive free school meals (20%). There is an above average proportion of pupils at an early stage of learning to speak English (OFSTED, 2007). The school has won many awards which include the Sports Active award and Healthy Schools gold award.

As shown on Appendix 15, Eagle Primary School is voluntary controlled by the Church of England. Nonetheless it serves a diverse population both in terms of ethnicity (School data: Arab, Bangladeshi, Black- Somali, Black Caribbean, Chinese, Indian, other Asian, other black African, other Pakistani, white British, white and Asian, white and black African, white and black Caribbean, white European) and religion. As a ‘Barrier Free’ school, it has a particular concern to fully involve and support pupils with disabilities and special educational needs. Additionally, priority is given to the enrolment of SEN pupils with physical disability. The school offers a range of services which include family learning, adult education, sports clubs, and the existence of a family support worker. The school organised pupils into classes by accepting a cohort of 45 pupils and organising it into three mixed
age classes of 30 pupils by combining pupils of Years 1 and 2, Years 3 and 4, and Year 5 and 6. This implied teachers working together to plan for the whole 2 year group of pupils and also an expectation of teachers to ‘work hard to differentiate planning’.

In September 2009 the school had a total of 55 pupils on the SEN register, of whom 23 pupils were on School action, 30 were on School action plus and 2 had Statements. In May 2011 there were a total of 25 pupils on SA, 29 on SAP, and 5 pupils with a Statement.

The SENCO had a key role in coordinating both with teachers and external agencies and so did the lead teacher assistant, who was responsible for monitoring the delivery of intervention programmes across all key stages.

According to a report produced by the SENCO:

Eagle school is committed to providing an inclusive education for all pupils. The starting point is first quality teaching. The teaching staff are made aware and given the opportunity to discuss and plan for the needs of identified pupils through review meetings, pupil progress meetings, meeting with outside agencies, planned SEN staff meetings to write and review IEPs/ ILPs, team meetings (setting/ planning).

The school used a variety of types of planning which include IEPs, individual learning plans and group learning plans, and provision mapping (Appendix 13). There were two different types of IEPs in use during the period of this research study (See Appendix 7 and 6). These, along with the use of other forms of planning, were an example of the SENCO’s attempts to find ‘the best way’ to plan for pupils with SEN, disabilities and difficulties.

The first IEP document (in Appendix 7) was more detailed. It listed four ‘areas of need’ that could be ‘ticked’: cognition and learning; behaviour, emotional and social difficulty; communication and interaction needs; sensory and/ or physical needs. It also presented one to five or more 'broad
targets’, which should inform the short term SEN and mainstream lesson planning; the pupil’s ‘strengths’ and pupil’s ‘views’. It mentioned ‘suggested (class) strategies to be used’, and ‘additional support provided by school’, ‘how the parent/ carer could support the pupil at home’, and the forms of ‘monitoring and assessment’, the ‘next review date’ and ‘who to action review’. So, for example Faruhk’s IEP listed objectives for mobility and physical needs, communication, social/ emotional, and education: literacy, numeracy. And for each of these objectives it presented actions or strategies and outcomes, for example:

Fine motor skills programme – writing without tears, 2x25 minutes per week…; Outcomes: Letters are correctly formed and orientation and size has improved

Play leader to encourage to join in various team play activities such as cricket (record is kept of his participation); Outcomes: Faruhk is independently choosing different activities at playtime… He has developed a wider friendship group including boys and girls

In all the IEPs provided to me by the school during this study, the pupil’s views box was left blank.

The second type of IEP (in Appendix 8) was more focused on broad ‘objectives’, actions/ strategies, and outcomes.

ILPs referred to intervention programmes and the document listed pupils' names, either individually or in groups of two or three (GLP), the ‘broad aims’, the 'SEN stage’, and described with considerable detail what interventions were in place and who was responsible for delivering those interventions. For example:

TA name, 1:1, 3 x 15 mins, Direct phonics - book 2;
The provision map (see example on Appendix 13) organised pupils into three categories according to the ‘need’ for extra provision: ‘must’, ‘could’ and ‘should’. Pupils with statements of SEN, and pupils classified as being School Action plus would be placed under ‘must’; pupils on school action will be considered ‘should’ and pupils that teachers may be concerned about but are not identified as having SEN would be under ‘could’. Provision mapping was introduced to primary SENCOs as part of central LA training on ‘Leading on Inclusion’ (DfES 2005). According to the SENCO, ‘through provision mapping additional teacher assistant support is organised’. There seems to be some overlap between this and the other forms of planning in use and this can perhaps be explained by the fact that the SENCO was trying and testing this as a new way of managing individual planning and provision.

The interventions presented in the Provision maps collected are similar across all years, with only minor differences. For example, the interventions for Years 2 and 6 were:

Year 2 – ILP (literacy), GLP (literacy) PG, fine motor skills, handwriting, narrative therapy, SALT work, direct phonics, ICT support, EMA support, behaviour emotional, catch up, medical/therapy, additional numeracy TA support in class, wave 3 maths, barrier-free, ILP (numeracy), GLP (numeracy), social communication

Year 6 - ILP (literacy), GLP (literacy), literacy programme guided reading, literacy programme narrative therapy, handwriting, wave 3 maths, SALT work, direct phonics, SPLD support, behaviour emotional, individual in-class support, additional literacy TA support in class, additional numeracy TA support in class, barrier-free, reading comprehension, EMA support, social
communication, medical/ therapy (Extracted from a Provision map provided)

The Provision maps also listed ‘Actions’ to be performed by staff. These included support measures, future interventions, issues, progress updates and tasks for staff. Examples of specific support measures are ‘repeat instructions’, ‘visual support’, ‘pre teaching of vocabulary’, ‘focus on eating lunch’. The interventions listed under ‘Actions’ were those planned for the future like ‘possible self-esteem group’, ‘social communication after half term’. The issues mentioned in the Provision map included ‘many gaps in literacy – poor reading’, ‘poor attendance’. Additionally, it could mention progress updates were, for example, ‘good progress’ and actions for school staff such as ‘complete a CAF – possible non entrance to SATS’.

Since pupils under ‘could’ were those who had not been identified as having SEN, the list of ‘actions’ referred mainly to monitoring and to concerns for example ‘under-achiever – low self-esteem – needs confidence building’, ‘very slow pace’, ‘poor attendance – is receiving 1:1 tuition’. These pupils were also assigned to interventions like GLP literacy and Wave 3 Maths.

Another planning document used was a table that showed ‘Assembly groups’, which were sessions usually aimed at ‘low average’, ‘booster children’ that ran during assembly time. These included literacy support, comprehension, spelling, handwriting, talk partners, and mental maths.

A list of all the interventions mentioned during fieldwork can be found in Appendix 16.

In this section I have presented an illustrative example from one of the English schools that took part in the study. The aim of this vignette was to exemplify the type of data collected in schools in England. The next section presents an analysis of the data across schools organised into two main
themes: planning and provision. Appendix 15 presents basic indicators for each of the schools that participated in the study (e.g. Type of school, age range, % pupils receiving FSM).

5.2.2 Looking across schools: responding to difference

It's personalising the learning, we take that very very very seriously, so every child is very different and we try, and match what we have to what they need, we don't get it right all the time... (Eel High School)

The quote captures rather well the essence of individual planning and provision, it consists of matching what the school has available to the needs of the pupils. In this section I will elaborate on the schools’ responses to the pupils identified as different and ‘needing something different’.

With a view to answering my second research question, I will start by focusing on planning and the forms of planning used in the schools that took part in the study. I will then consider provision, moving to my third research question: ‘What interventions and provision do these plans propose?’.

Firstly, I will centre my attention on whole-school responses to difference such as differentiation and organising pupils by ‘ability’ and show how these relate to individual planning. Secondly, I will concentrate on interventions, trying to give an idea of the repertoire in use by the English schools that took part in the study. Finally I will turn to resources, tools and structures relevant to individual planning and provision.

Planning

The schools that took part in the study had various approaches to planning. The four main types of plans are individual plans (Individual Education Plans - IEP, Individual Behaviour Plans – IBP, Individual Learning Plans –
ILP, provision maps, pupil progress maps/tables and differentiated whole class plans.

IEP, standing for individual education plans were used in all schools, however, the contents and the uses of the IEPs were not the same. Along with IEPs, most schools also mentioned IBPs (individual behaviour plans), these were similar to IEPs but the focus was on behaviour targets rather than on curricular targets. A blank IBP from Elm Academy can be found in Appendix 11.

At Eucalyptus Primary School the Individual Education Plan referred to a document with three targets that the pupils should work to achieve (See in Appendix 9 on of Sharon’s IEPs). For each of the targets four aspects were mentioned. These were:

1. 'achievement criteria',
2. 'possible strategies for use in class',
3. 'ideas for support teacher/ assistant' and
4. 'outcomes'.

The IEP targets in this school were set by the mainstream class teachers four times a year, taking into account advice from external services such as the psychologist or speech and language therapist and using a computer programme that had a template and targets. The latter were not seen as appropriate by the teachers and were not used by the school staff. The targets were 'steps towards achieving learning objectives, they’re broken down, they’re a lot smaller' (Year 6 teacher, Eucalyptus primary). They could be curricular, behavioural, emotional, and/or social. In general there was minimal input from the SENCO in the process. The SENCO’s role was to support the teachers if required. For example, usually when pupils had failed to achieve the targets set.
Similarly to what happened at the Eucalyptus Primary School, at the Elm Academy, both IEPs and IBPs (See example in Appendix 11) consisted of three targets which were seen as 'small steps' and success criteria that demonstrated that those targets were achieved. These two schools were situated in the same Local Educational Authority. IEPs/IBPs also listed 'grouping for teaching purposes' and 'curriculum and teaching methods'. Contrarily to what was observed at the Eagle primary, at Elm Secondary school the pupils’ involvement in the process of setting targets was seen as vital.

As previously described in the school vignette (p. 155), at Eagle Primary School IEPs listed one to five or more ‘broad targets’, which informed class planning for individual pupils in addition to suggested (class) strategies and additional support provided by school. Other individual planning documents were also used such as individual learning plans (ILPs) and group learning plans (GLPs) in which individual or groups of pupils and staff members were assigned to intervention programmes. Additionally, as explained in the school vignette, provision maps were also used to assign pupils to existing responses (See Appendix 13). The overlap between the various forms of planning used could be linked to the SENCOs attempt to find better ways of managing individual planning and provision.

Even though pupil progress tracking was used for all pupils and not only those with individual planning, it is relevant to this study because it referred to checking whether students were progressing ‘as expected’. And it involved putting interventions in place for students who were not thought to be ‘progressing’ and ‘achieving’. This was done at the Elephant High School, by the 'head of learning' for Year 7 by checking the students’ records on a computer. This form of tracking pupils through their results was most
common at Secondary school level. See for example the SEN Register from Echinacea College in Appendix 14.

On the contrary, pupil progress tables were used at Eucalyptus Primary School, and in this case they listed targets for individual pupils so that teachers would remember and act upon them during lessons. Pupils did not have to be in the SEN register to have their names on these ‘progress tables’, and those mentioned were not openly made aware of their targets.

Finally, whole class plans used by teachers to plan their lessons were differentiated and groups of pupils (e.g. blue, yellow, green, red, orange) or individual pupils were identified together with levels expected to be achieved, activities, teaching setting (inside/ outside) and support levels. An example of a differentiated Short Term plan used at Eucalyptus Primary School is presented Appendix 12.

Differentiation was relevant to individual planning both in terms of planning documents and also in terms of provision. In terms of planning, there were five types of differentiation. Differentiation by task meant planning different activities. Differentiation by targets involved planning for pupils to be working towards different targets. For example in a writing activity a group of pupils could be focusing on punctuation, whereas another group could have a target of marking names with capitals. Differentiation by outcome entailed the teacher having different expectations of the work produced by pupils. Differentiation by support was linked to planning the provision of extra support to certain pupils or groups, for example through a teaching assistant. And finally, differentiation by resources, which referred to planning and providing extra tools to certain pupils that pupils, such as a number line, or a computer.
Provision

As pointed out previously, not all aspects of diversity prompted teachers to consider individual planning and provision; the side of diversity that generated this response was mainly linked to ‘ability’ diversity. Data indicates that the there are three main themes linked to how the schools in the sample responded to student diversity through provision. These are: differentiation both in terms of planning and provision, grouping pupils for teaching purposes, and individualised forms of provision. I will now further develop these three issues and will close this section with a brief note on resources.

There was a sense that monitoring was a key part of responding to pupils’ needs. In the case of Year 2 pupils, teachers often referred to external assessments that would be done in Year 3, for example Rita (Eucalyptus Primary) being tested for dyscalculia. There was also internal monitoring as a response to the teacher’s ‘initial concern’ (referred to as the lower level of SEN register at Echinacea college, See Appendix 14); and also to assign pupils to interventions, or to move them between classes or sets as described in Marlee’s case, at Elderberry High School.

Differentiation

In the English schools, differentiation was mentioned by all teachers. This referred to a range of changes in the resources available to students, in the activities proposed and in the targets to be achieved. The way differentiation worked on written plans and in practice was that there were common curricular aims, and some common teaching moments but then different pupils would have different targets to achieve, different tasks to complete, as well as varying levels of support and resources available.
The notion of average was used by teachers when asked how differentiation worked in practice. Teachers often said that they would pitch or 'plot the learning objectives' at the average or 'middle of the class', and then differentiate up or down depending on the pupils. As the SENCO at Eagle Primary explained:

The high ability ones you give them extension, and the lower ability you break it down in smaller steps and that's where you scaffold their learning a lot more with worksheets and operators and the use of TAs.

A similar process was described by a Year 7 teacher at Eel High School, in a class with four pupils who 'could not read' and three pupils 'who are actually good levels four'. ‘There'll always be like three parts, there is always pitch at the middle and then you differentiate/ extend’. So, in most cases, differentiation involved a view of the individual pupils as part of 'level' groups. In some cases differentiation involved individual planning and individualised provision. For example, a resource like a TA or the use of a laptop could be assigned to an individual pupil and that would usually be mentioned in the whole class differentiated lesson plan.

In general, differentiation was used to refer to having different tasks, targets, resources, and/ or support. But also 'to differentiate' is associated with 'differentiate down' as opposed to 'extension' for those students above the class average.

**Organising by ability**

After having focused on the process of differentiation which was present in all schools, I will concentrate on how some schools organised students by their ability into classes or sets. Similarly to what was described regarding differentiation, this practice is also relevant to the process of responding to pupil diversity through individual planning. By having pupils organised by
their perceived ability, teachers would plan for groups and only had to plan for individual pupils in very specific cases. In most cases individual responses were ‘add-ons’ to the existing differentiated plan aimed at those pre-established ‘ability groups’. On the other hand, in most cases pupils were only organised ‘by ability’ for literacy and numeracy (and in some schools science).

As I mentioned in the school vignette, Eagle Primary School had a rather special way of organising students: each year the school accepted 45 pupils from each year group, these were then grouped into 3 mixed age classes of 30 pupils from 2 year groups (e.g. years 1 and 2; years 5 and 6). These mixed age classes were then reorganised based on student ‘ability’ for literacy and numeracy lessons.

Eucalyptus Primary School on the other hand did not organise pupils by their ‘ability’, apart from phonics sessions run with the younger pupils. This was the only school in the sample which did not organise students by their ‘ability’ for literacy and numeracy classes.

Eel High School organised Year 7 pupils based on ‘ability’ information from the primary schools (SATs and teacher assessment) into six forms. The ‘top’ four sets had a maximum of 30 pupils (on average between 25-28) and contained pupils working at levels four/five. The fifth set was capped at around 20 and the lower set had a maximum of 15 pupils. This ‘bottom set’, as the teacher referred to it, had trained primary teacher (the assistant SENCO) who was with the students for most of the lessons, following a primary school model, and subject specialists who team taught with that teacher. It always had at least 2 adults in the room. When explaining the philosophy behind this set the teacher said:
Other schools have sort of picked up in some ways, calling it a nurture class or a transition class, that kind of thing. But, for us it’s part of everything else, it’s not separate; they follow exactly the same curriculum. We do everything that everyone else is doing, we might do it in a different way, it might take a little bit longer, the idea is that if an inspector was coming and inspect year seven, he would see, he or she would see the same, topics, being taught to across the spectrum. Because that’s the thing, we do make a very strong point that we are a mainstream school, and we don’t, it’s not a unit, it’s not a unit provision, it’s bottom class in year seven.

Elderberry High School also had a primary based model for two lower ability classes. In this case the lower class was described as the SEN class and had around 10 pupils; the next class had around 20 pupils who were ‘struggling in literacy and numeracy’; the other four classes had a maximum of 23-27 pupils.

Elm Academy had a different setup with 'huge learning spaces' with 120 students in one big room, with a lead teacher using a microphone and four other teachers, plus two TAs in each area, plus any TAs attached to individuals.

Also when it comes to organising pupils by their 'ability' pupils with EAL created differing responses. In some schools these pupils were placed in the lower 'sets' due to their difficulties in literacy. Eel High School opted for 'middle sets' because:

'EAL pupils need to be among a language rich environment (...) [and] a lot of our children in the bottom of the school have speech and language difficulties, are very immature, it's not an environment in which to thrive if you just simply want to learn English'.
Interventions

Differentiation and ability grouping were ways of managing student diversity that in principle took into account and dealt with all pupils in general. On the contrary, for some students teachers planned individualised interventions. Individualised interventions were closely linked to the presence of extra resources in schools which could be human support, or the existence of (extra) tools and structures.

I will start by focusing on extra support, which can be divided into a combination of in-out of class and one to one-group support. Figure 4 can help visualise interventions by placing them in one of the four quadrants, so for example a Teaching Assistant (TA) who was in the mainstream class supporting ‘a table’ would be placed in the top right section. Whereas a TA assigned to a specific pupil in class would be placed in the top left section. A TA who took a group of pupils out for a communication intervention (e.g. social group) would be in the bottom right sector. While a TA who took a pupil out to a one to one intervention (e.g. Catch up literacy intervention) would be on the bottom left section.

Figure 4 - Ways in which extra support/ interventions can be delivered: in class or out of class; one to one or in group
In all schools the existence of support staff, called teaching assistants (TAs), learning support assistants or support workers, allowed students to receive extra support within their mainstream classroom. Pupils who received support within the classroom were usually those in the SEN register. However, the management of the teaching assistants was done by each school and so the roles varied. An example of the kind of support provided by TAs to pupils is shown in Figure 5. It was common that TAs had a role in the mainstream classroom that consisted of repeating or adapting information provided by teachers, supporting with the development of activities and ‘helping to stay on task’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading text</th>
<th>Spelling/ providing key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanuensis</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ideas/ answers</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining task</td>
<td>Modifying task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting equipment</td>
<td>Help re behaviour/ keeping on task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 - List of types of support given by TAs at Elm Academy (extracted from report form to be used by TAs)

Alongside the in-class support all schools had some form of out of class interventions. There were numerous intervention programmes; for example phonics, communication groups, talking partners, assembly groups, one to one tuition during and after school.

Some programmes were bought by schools, for example Beat Dyslexia, and then were applied by teaching assistants, out of the mainstream classroom. In the same way, programmes like Every Child a Reader/ Reading Recovery, that were ‘designed for quickly raising attainment in literacy for children who are the lowest achieving in literacy after their first year of school’ (Institute of Education University of London 2013) require expensive training of the school staff.
Most provision focused on literacy, including interventions for pupils with EAL, and numeracy. But there were also interventions targeting motor skills, behaviour, and social and emotional difficulties. As an example, a list of interventions compiled by the SENCO at Eagle Primary School is presented in Figure 60 below (the information presented was extracted from a School Report to the Governing Body produced by the SENCO).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Motor skills programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct phonics/ letter and sounds</td>
<td>Clever fingers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs in pictures/ words in pictures</td>
<td>Write from the start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch up</td>
<td>Handwriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat dyslexia</td>
<td>Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word shark</td>
<td>Wave 3 mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single word spelling programme</td>
<td>ICT resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and communication</td>
<td>Social, emotional and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative therapy</td>
<td>Social and communication groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind mapping</td>
<td>Raising self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture detectives</td>
<td>Buddy system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory memory</td>
<td>Positive behaviour and reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ communication group</td>
<td>systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening and memory groups</td>
<td>Webster Stratton – parent survival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 - List of intervention programmes available at Eagle Primary School

There seemed to be more, and more varied, intervention programmes in primary schools. However, secondary schools also had intervention programmes, which tended to focus in the same areas. These were mainly literacy (e.g. Core intervention and Reading recovery in Echinacea College) and numeracy. However, there were also interventions targeting behaviour, social, and emotional issues.

There seemed to be a trend in the interventions proposed, with a move from more individualised interventions for Year 2 pupils when compared to more small group interventions in years 6 and 7 and no interventions out of the classroom for older pupils (years 10 and 11). Additionally, a table that shows responses across all the eight English schools that took part in this study can be found in Appendix 16.
Both in primary and secondary school the choice of interventions seemed to be influenced by implicit priorities and expectations in terms of age and levels that should be reached. For example, assessments made by the educational psychologist at Eucalyptus Primary School were systematically left until pupils reached Year 3. This could be linked to ‘maturity’ and child development. Another example of the influence of pupils’ age in provision is that interventions such as EAL at Eagle Primary School were targeted at Year 2 pupils. This could be associated with principles of early intervention but it is also justified by the limited resources that force schools to prioritise certain groups. Thus, some of the changes in interventions proposed were not necessarily based on the pupils’ ‘needs’. Since EAL support was prioritised in Year 2, Victoria had extra support twice a week in literacy and a comprehension group. In Year 3, EAL provision was not a priority and so she did not have any EAL support:

I’m in charge, I do the EAL provision for the school and we’ve only got one teaching assistant to work with all children in the school, so... we prioritise year groups, otherwise we can’t do it, so... the year two was a priority when she was... but year three isn’t. So she hasn’t got any because she’s not... that needy. (Teacher H, Eagle, Year 3)

Another example of this is how at Eel High School only pupils in years 7 and 8 were expected to ‘use’ the learning support centre:

[in the learning support centre] It’s mainly [year] 7’s, 8’s and 9’s because 10’s and 11’s, they need to be doing their work. It does tend to focus on 7’s, 8’s and 9’s, mainly 7’s and 8 but there are, there have been some 9’s that have been in there. (...) tends to be sort of middle..., middle forms, sort of disaffected young men (Year 7 teacher, Eel High School)

This is in line with what was reported previously in the sense that the choice of interventions provided had a very strong link to contextual factors such as
resources available, and in many cases did not have the pupil as a starting point.

Finally, even though flexibility cannot be considered an actual intervention, it was perceived by some teachers as essential when responding to students (Year 6 and Year 3 teachers at Eagle Primary School). It included for instance being able to adapt planning according to how the pupil was responding on the moment, and allowing pupils to leave early for lunch or playtime to accommodate their mobility needs. This notion of flexibility seemed part of the school ethos at Eagle Primary School.

**Resources: tools and structures**

Having discussed a significant resource which was the support provided by the extra teaching and support staff I will now focus on other resources (physical) that were used in the schools that took part in this study. These could also be divided into in and out class resources (Figure 4, p.168), even if this is not as straightforward as when referring to human resources. For example, a home-school (behaviour) book and a quiet room/ space to be used by students when needed (namely by Eric) was referred to both at Eagle Primary School and Emu High School. Other items mentioned were a visual timetable, a traffic light system (linked to behaviour), the use of a laptop, adapted materials, a page filter, a spellchecker, number lines and counting hoops, and word banks.

Schools as a whole had organisational ways to manage pupil diversity. Not only in some cases were pupils organised by ability as it has already been explained, but also classes of the 'lower sets' in secondary schools would have fewer pupils; or, also in secondary schools, there might be a class that followed a 'primary school' model.
Infrastructures in and out of the classroom included a 'support table' within the mainstream classroom, and a resource room out of the mainstream classroom. There was a 'Learning support area/centre/base/unit', and/or:

- inclusion faculty (Elephant High School),
- Curriculum access unit (Echinacea College),
- reading recovery room (Eucalyptus Primary School),
- 'little side rooms' (Elm Academy)

Another key structural aspect were the partnerships created between the schools and specialist schools; Mental Health and Social Care Trusts, CAMHS (Child and adolescent mental health services); EMTAS (Ethnic minority and traveller achievement service); YOT (Youth offending team); PRU (pupil referral unit) and organisations that supported the vocational, personal, social and academic development of young people and adults.

5.3 Summary

This chapter presented the analysis of the findings about individual planning and provision in the English schools that took part in this study. I started by analysis focusing on a pupil level. I presented four pupil case vignettes to illustrate the data collected and the differences in the way schools conceptualised and responded to pupil diversity. I then looked across all the pupils’ cases with a view to analyse the ways teachers and schools conceptualised difference. I discussed four themes related to how teachers conceptualised pupil diversity: ‘Ability and average’, ‘SEN’, ‘EAL’ and ‘Same pupil, different conceptualisations’.

After this I focus on a school level. I presented a school vignette, which offered an in-depth view of the school and its processes regarding individual planning. Subsequently, I presented my analysis of the schools’ responses to pupil diversity across all schools. It started by discussing the various types
Chapter 5: Individual planning in English schools

and uses of planning. This was followed by an outline of the schools’ provision with regards to individual planning. This was organised into four themes: ‘Differentiation’, ‘Organising by ability’, ‘interventions’, and ‘Resources: tools and structures’.

The next chapter will do a follow a similar structure and process but with a focus on the data from the Portuguese schools.
Chapter 6: Individual planning and difference in Portuguese schools

All Portuguese schools have been attributed pseudonyms starting with the letter P. I have called the primary schools Peacock 1st Cycle School and Physalis 1st Cycle School, as it is shown in Figure 1 (p. 100); schools from one cluster all have animal names (Peacock, Pelican, Pheasant, Parrot) and schools from the other cluster have plant names (Physalis, Primula).

This chapter has two main sections; I will start by focusing on pupils’ cases. In this section I will present four pupil case studies with a view to illustrate the data collected in the study. Out of the 19 pupils identified by teachers I have selected four cases, one from each year in each school to allow differences linked to schools and school years attended to be shown. In addition, these four cases had good quantity and quality of data and they were representative of what was found in general.

So, Alexandre and Raquel’s are the selected Year 1 pupils’ cases that aim to show in more depth how pupils were described by their Year 1 and then Year 2 teachers; and what responses the schools had put in place over those two years. The same applies to Alberto and Paulo’s cases, which were identified in Year 4 and followed up in Year 5. The four case vignettes will be followed by a commentary that looks across pupil cases and focuses on the themes that emerged from the whole Portuguese pupil data set.

I will then focus on schools by presenting the Physalis/Primula school cluster in more depth. This will be followed by a look across schools’ cases focused on how pupil diversity is responded to, through planning and provision. I will end this chapter with a summary of the theme identified.
6.1 Pupil case level

Table 10 and Table 11 show the pseudonyms of the pupils identified and the school and year they attended over the two-year period of data collection. So, as shown on Table 10, at Peacock 1st cycle school only two pupils were identified by the teacher in Year 1 (Alexandre and Helio), while Barton only joined the class in Year 2. On the other hand, at this same school the Year 4 teacher identified the maximum number of pupils established for the study (n=6); as these pupils moved to lower secondary school four went to Pelican 2nd and 3rd cycle School (Alberto, Frederico, Arlete and Pedro); one went to Pheasant 2nd, 3rd cycle and Secondary School (Vitor); and one to Parrot 2nd and 3rd cycle School (Bruno). On Table 11 we can see that at Physalis 1st cycle School four pupils were identified by the Year 1 teacher (Raquel, Ricardo, Filipe and Isabel) and they all stayed in the same school in Year 2. The Year 4 teacher identified the maximum number of pupils (Diana, Paulo, Maria, Catarina, Madalena, and Leonardo) and all but one went to the same 2nd and 3rd cycle School (Primula). Leonardo moved away and from the region and the new school was not interested to participate in the research project.
### Table 10 - Students identified in Peacock 1st cycle school in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peacock 1st cycle school</th>
<th>School attended in 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helio</td>
<td>Peacock 1st cycle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Barton)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederico</td>
<td>Pelican 2nd/ 3rd cycle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitor</td>
<td>Pheasant 2nd cycle – Secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Parrot 2nd/ 3rd cycle school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11 - Students identified in Physalis 1st cycle school in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physalis 1st cycle school</th>
<th>School attended in 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Physalis 1st cycle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>Primula 2nd/ 3rd cycle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madalena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>Not part of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Students identified in Peacock 1st cycle school in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011

Table 11 - Students identified in Physalis 1st cycle school in 2009-2010 and schools they attended in 2010-2011
6.1.1 Pupil case vignettes

Alexandre

I will start by presenting the case of Alexandre, who was in Year 1 at Peacock 1st cycle School in 2009-2010. All data presented originates from either the teacher interviews or the individual planning documents provided to me by the teachers. Alexandre is a boy whose home language is Portuguese.

Alexandre's mainstream teacher described him as a pupil with difficulties, 'way behind', who often refused to work and had a very aggressive behaviour, constantly testing boundaries. When explaining the reasons for Alexandre's 'problem', the teacher stated that he 'lived in an institution' [equivalent to 'being in care' or 'looked after children' in England] and that she was not sure whether 'his problem actually is an emotional problem':

... we want to understand whether he doesn't work because he doesn't want to and that's the easiest way for him to be or whether there's more of an emotional problem and he has that block and that that's as much as he'll be able to do [in Portuguese 'não dá mais que aquilo']

Although this pupil was identified by his teacher as problematic and different from the majority, he did not have a formal plan for provision different from his mainstream peers. At the time of the interview nothing was being done at school level, and according to the teacher 'it was still too early'. On the other hand, the teacher expected that Alexandre would be accepted 'for special education' as she had made a formal identification and request but she knew the pupil would probably have to wait until Year 2 to receive support from special education. Additionally, 'because of his other issues' he had attended a child development support centre but the teacher was not sure whether this was simply for assessment, or if he would receive some support out of school.
When the same teacher was interviewed in Year 2, she described Alexandre as ‘that boy who had lots of difficulties’ and explained how he was way behind the 'big group'. In terms of responses to the perceived difficulties the teacher explained that the previous year Alexandre was assessed by an external support centre, but she had only received the results 'now'. The assessment report suggested that he should be 'integrated in the 3’ [supported through the Law 3/2008] and had a checklist [ICF-based]. Now in Year 2 he was going to be supported by the special education team. A year after the initial interview the teacher said that the special education team dealt with the cases on a first come first served basis, and that there were many cases:

And only yesterday, I only found out yesterday that he's going to be integrated. Now I need to know when he's actually going to be integrated, he is formally, but in practice...

According to the teacher the pupil was going to receive support once a week ‘which is very little’. While within the classroom Alexandre and other 4 pupils do different work ['tenho de fazer o trabalho diferenciado'] in Portuguese and Mathematics. The teacher explained that they had to do different work, as what they were doing had ‘nothing to do with the others’:

'I don't use the Year 2 books with them, I bring work from home because no... the big group, they all use the book, out of the 23, these 5 don't, all the others do.'

**Raquel**

Raquel was 7 years old and she was in Year 1 at Physalis primary school when I first interviewed her teacher. According to the teacher, the pupil lived only with her grandmother who worked as a cook and so the girl went to school with neighbours, usually got in around 8am, and in the afternoon
the grandmother would pick her up around 6 or 7pm. She would almost always stay with relatives so the grandmother could go to work. The teacher explained Raquel's complex family life:

she is 7 years old [the peers are 6] and has a very difficult history of life, because the father has already died, drug addict and the mother abandoned her. If you speak to her she'll tell you immediately ‘my mum abandoned me because she doesn’t like me’.

And how that 'complicated life' impacted on her school life:

She has a much much reduced capacity to focus and she has lots of concerns. Life at home is very complex. She has many other concerns. (...) I tell a story and ask a question and she doesn't know. 'I didn't hear, I didn't hear', she can't concentrate.

The first thing she does when you give her a work sheet is saying 'I don't know how to do it, I can't do it'.

She's very naughty, she's a little devil in the playground. (...) She’s very difficult, she easily clashes with everyone, I have lots of complaints from parents.

Despite the long list of 'issues', the teacher later states that 'the problem is really Portuguese language'. Furthermore, in terms of the teacher's discourse Raquel is always grouped with another pupil (Ricardo). The teacher stated that she gives Raquel and Ricardo more attention and must plan different work, while all the others work at the same level:

With them we're going back to the beginning, it's the previous planning adapted to them, with different worksheets, I honestly don’t know what I can do, I got to a point I don't know where to go, it’s with little words, trying to read, (...) going back to the beginning, identifying graphemes, associating graphemes with phonemes, exactly the same planning'.

The teacher described how she used a weekly behaviour chart which had a section on homework and that with Raquel she pretended to forget 'otherwise she would spend all her life getting red signs'.
Similarly to the previous pupil case presented (Alexandre), the teacher does not have a formal plan for different provision for Raquel but she reported asking for extra support during the 3rd trimester. This support would be delivered by a mainstream primary teacher twice a week, 45 minutes, out of the classroom:

Taking into account that the difficulties of these children are getting worse, seriously showing, whether it would be possible for them to go to the extra support. We’ll see. I’m waiting for an answer.

The teacher planned to refer Raquel to Speech and Language Therapy in Year 2 because ‘she has articulation problems, she’s starting to reveal [problems] in consonant letters. Even though she cannot identify the [consonant] letters, she only recognises vowels and diphthongs’. She also planned to refer her to the psychologist for an assessment because:

with the new law 3/2008 they’ve reduced eligibility a lot so she won’t be able to ‘get in’ unless the psychologist finds something... something very serious. Otherwise she’ll be a pupil with difficulties and will have educational support [under DN 50/2005], that’s it, a recovery plan and that kind of thing.

When followed up in Year 2 the same teacher said:

in terms of success, it’s a fail, because they [Raquel and Ricardo] are working at a Year 1 level in Portuguese and Mathematics, they don’t achieve the Year 2 competencies but what they should achieve at Year 1 level, they’re also not achieving.

In Year 2 Raquel ‘really worried’ the teacher and she was described as a pupil with ‘difficulties, serious really, extremely serious’, whose ‘progress was very little or none’. According to the teacher, Raquel ‘doesn’t make an effort, (...) doesn’t invest much (...) she gives up easily’, she ‘still cannot read or write (...) she can read about 5 words, but I need to be there one hour,
what's this, what's that because if I'm there she'll read, I ask her what letter is this? She'll tell me a P, a T, an L, whatever springs to mind'. In Mathematics 'she can do until number 10, but she has to copy to be able to write in words'.

When trying to further explain the pupil’s difficulties, the teacher explained again how Raquel had a 'very complicated life', still lived only with the paternal grandmother who was unemployed this year. The teacher stated that:

it's something more... I cannot explain, today she knows, tomorrow she doesn't, she remembers, she doesn't. She wants, she always has lots of things to talk about that happen in the family (...) there're always things happening, and she tells me everything but if I ask did you do your homework? She'll say I have something to tell you, (...) and will make up all sorts of excuses not to talk about work and she'll always try not to work.

In terms of school responses, Raquel had a recovery/ catch up plan, along with other 5 pupils in her class. Linked to this she received extra support once a week for one hour and a half in a group of 7 pupils, as a way of 'pulling them up' and hoping that 'explaining in a different way, in a different context, there would be a click'. The group was composed by a pupil who failed Year 2 and had a follow up/ chaperone plan [acompanhamento] and six pupils with recovery/ catch up plans 'because they had low grades on Portuguese language, had problems with their spelling and wrote texts of one or two sentences maximum' (For an explanation of these types of plan see Chapter 3.2). This extra support was delivered outside of the classroom by a teacher who was part of the school management team and did not always manage to go. For this reason the class teacher agreed with the support teacher that she would define what they did, each of the pupils took specific work to do. For example with Raquel the teacher required the support teacher to work only Portuguese language.
In the classroom, Raquel worked with 'different worksheets always, always, always, always', and the teacher said she was 'in the despair stage' and kept trying various methods of learning to read:

last year the phonologic method, now I'm using the 28 words method with them, I'm starting to look at the global method

The teacher wanted to identify the student to receive support from the special education team and was provided by the grandmother with a report, which according to the teacher:

was too psychological, doesn't mention learning difficulties, there are no tests (...) to check the abilities, mathematical reasoning and that kind of thing. Nothing like that, and I'll try and speak to the GP in order to have an assessment based on the ICF (......). The report isn't wrong, but for us, to ask for an assessment [from the special education team] it isn't enough, I need a report based on the ICF for me to identify her, for there to be a first assessment, then she'll be accepted or not, but otherwise I can't even identify her.

Alberto

Alberto was described by his Year 4 teacher at Peacock primary school as 'the most severe' with special educational needs in the class, he was working with a Year 2 curriculum and was not going to 'be able to do everything'. The teacher stated that he had a severe 'learning disability' [problemática a nível cognitivo] and commented on the fact that despite she thought Portuguese was the language spoken at home, Alberto had serious Portuguese language problems. She mentioned that the pupil was from Rom ethnicity. From his IEP we find out that Alberto lived with his mother and other family members but does not have contact with his father. The pupil’s mother was illiterate, and 'offers few social and cultural experiences because of her economic difficulties and the rules of the Roma culture'.

In terms of responses to Alberto’s perceived needs, he went to Speech and Language Therapy one hour per week outside of the classroom, he would also get support from a special education teacher one hour per week (with another pupil) and sometimes some extra support with another teacher, when needed and when the teacher was available.

Both in and out of class Alberto was working with an adapted Year 2 curriculum, simplified and focused on what he needed ‘to catch up, to achieve the basic essential competencies’. The teacher said she was neglecting the sciences and focusing mainly and giving priority to the Portuguese language, as this was ‘the basis for everything else’. He had specific work, specific worksheets and when the teacher explained that when she could not ‘give him attention, for example when teaching new contents, he copies everything that’s on the blackboard, he also listens to what is being taught to the others’.

When referring to the planning, the special education teacher explained that in Year 5 he would have an Individual Specific Curriculum [CEI] but that his planning in Year 4 was the same as the one used in Year 3 as there was ‘always something that needs to be reinforced’.

When Alberto moved to Pelican school to Year 5, I interviewed the teacher who was the head of Alberto’s class [Diretor de Turma]. This Science teacher described how the pupil had numerous difficulties and would not have ‘a chance to survive’ doing Year 5 work as he ‘only acquired competencies of Year 2 level’. He did not have ‘a series of essential pre-requisites, which automatically would derail his school achievement’. The pupil had ‘limitations decoding written text and processing written information’, he was ‘highly dependent on the teacher’ and according to the teacher, this was
linked to a 'developmental delay'. He struggled to follow the group but the DL 3/2008 demanded that he attended Year 5. Socially, Alberto did not have 'problems', he was ‘very kind’, did ‘not conflict with other students’, and was ‘liked by the classmates’. Nevertheless the teacher anticipated that 'he will not continue studying [after the compulsory school age]'.

During the first two or three weeks of Year 5, Alberto had attended all subjects with his class so that the teachers could assess his abilities and difficulties. Later on, at the time of the interview, Alberto only joined his Year 5 class for 'more practical subjects in which difficulties in reading had less impact'. These were: Science, PE [Educação Física], Music, Arts [Educação visual e tecnológica], Citizenship [Formação cívica] and Project [Área projeto]. The pupil did not attend the subjects of Portuguese Language, English, History and Mathematics with the class. 'If the pupil is out of all these subjects he will have a series of gaps in his timetable', explained the teacher, when justifying the need for alternative subjects. The pupil had Language and Communication, and Calculation. These were considered ‘simplified and more practical subjects’ with other students who had specific individual curricula [CEI]. These were taught by various teachers: the special education teacher, a primary school teacher and mainstream teachers who (usually for medical reasons or being close to retiring age) could not teach classes full-time. Alberto also had one session in which he would go autonomously (and unsupervised by any teacher) to the library/ resource centre. The medium/ long term aim of his specific individual curriculum and specifically of this activity was to integrate the pupil in active life in society.

Alberto had tests that were adapted to his ability, according to his head of Year 5 due to his poor orthography and spelling sometimes teachers had to ask him what he had written, additionally when marking teachers would not
penalise if he did not spell words correctly. The Year 5 class had a reduced number of pupils (21) because of having other 6 pupils under the DL 3/2008, 3 of them with a specific individual curriculum (Alberto being one of them), and 2 pupils under the DN 50/2005.

Paulo

Paulo was described by the Year 4 teacher at Physalis primary school as a very interested pupil who made an effort but had difficulties in Portuguese Language (writing, interpretation) and 'many traits linked to dyslexia' like swapping syllables, a 'misadjusted' calligraphy and difficulty to concentrate. His 'working pace was very slow and the emotional instability made it hard for him to stand still'.

The pupil was a cause of concern for the teacher because his difficulties in Portuguese hindered all the other areas. For example he struggled to read and understand Mathematics problems, and in mental Mathematics the teacher was ‘always expecting’ he would have a better result than what he did. Paulo was one of three pupils whose case 'kept the teacher awake at night' thinking whether failing him at the end of Year 3 was the best decision. At the end of Year 3 the teacher decided to pass the pupil after holding a meeting with the parents who committed to help. Faced with the pupil’s difficulties the teacher informally asked a psychologist who worked with other pupils of the school to 'try and understand what was going on with him'. The teacher felt that Paulo should receive 'psychological support' to help him concentrate, however, 'due to the lack resources' the school encouraged the father to seek that support outside.

Paulo had a recovery plan (Appendix 24) and 1h30 a week of extra support outside of the classroom with a group of pupils. His recovery plan described
him as an ‘interested and participative pupil, with difficulty to concentrate and poor organisation skills’ who should:

- read regularly,
- participate in writing activities,
- express his doubts and difficulties in Mathematics,
- develop his attention capacity,
- be more dedicated, and
- take care with the presentation and organisation of his work.

Paulo’s recovery plan also listed a number of ‘differentiated strategies to be used in the classroom’:

- incentivising participation through situations that facilitate learning’ (e.g. reading stories, organising word lists, memorising rhymes),
- diversifying work strategies (pairs, group),
- support during activities,
- creating situations of leadership and games that facilitate the socialisation.

Finally, the recovery plan lists as resources the support teacher, an inclined surface to work, a computer, software and other educational games; it also states that the pupil should receive educational support and psychotherapeutic support.

When he was in Year 5 I interviewed the head teacher of his class at Primula school. Paulo was described as:
'one of the worst', 'he doesn't bother, couldn't care less', 'he does lots of spelling errors, he cannot read, he cannot write, he doesn't know how to follow. And the worst is he's very absent-minded, he doesn't pay attention to anything. His notebooks are shameful'; 'he is a chaos'.

When trying to explain the pupil's behaviour the Year 5 teacher, stated that she did not understand, she mentioned that Paulo's parents were interested and spent money on getting external support for him, she also referred to gaps in his knowledge and that his lack of ability to follow reading could account for his poor concentration. However, his lack of interest and will to overcome were presented as the main reasons for failure. The teacher revealed some frustration when she said that although he did not do 'his part' in the end 'he might just pass'.

In terms of responses Paulo was part of a class with a total of 23 pupils, of which 10 pupils have recovery/ catch up plans, 2 have follow up/ chaperone plans (because they were repeating the year) and 2 were identified 'with SEN'. Paulo had a recovery plan and received extra support outside the classroom, in Portuguese, English and Mathematics with other pupils with difficulties. The head of his Year 5 class also spoke to the parents with a view to incentivise them to 'perform their role'. Possibly as a response to this the Paulo was receiving extra support out of school, to which the teacher claimed she had not seen any positive outcomes and 'it might even be making it worse'.

Inside the classroom the interviewed teacher said she 'is available to take longer and answer their questions, but they don't even have any'. In terms of assessment Paulo did the same tests as his colleagues because the teacher 'didn't receive any report saying it couldn't be the same'.
6.1.2 Looking across pupils’ cases: conceptualising difference

I will now look across all pupils' cases and comment on the main themes, referring also to examples from all the Portuguese pupils. A short summary of how each of the 19 pupils was described by the teachers and other school staff can be found in Appendix 17 and Appendix 18.

If we start by focusing on who was identified as needing individual planning across the Portuguese schools that took part in the study, the legislation had a high impact in the repertoire of ‘problems, categories, and labels’ used by teachers. The actual legislation names (e.g. '3/2008' or '3', '319', '50') were quite often used by teachers to refer to students, for example 'he's from/ he belongs to the 3'. Likewise students who have ‘specific individual curricula’ [Curriculo especifico individual – CEI] were also sometimes referred to as ‘pupils who are CEI’. I will present some quotes that are representative of the teachers and special education teachers’ discourse:

In my opinion this boy ‘is 3’ [referring to the DL 3/2008], in my opinion, but I don’t make the assessments. Taking into account the other '50' [referring to the DN 50/2005] that I have, this [pupil] stands out negatively (head of Year 5I at Pelican school)

Usually a pupil with special educational needs has a medical statement saying there are some difficulties that need to be taken into account. And the case of the students with difficulties in learning in my view, I understand it to be something temporary, I believe that with work and effort they will overcome it... I think there is something there for some reason, or... a greater difficulty in a certain area but I am almost absolutely sure and I really want to believe that it is possible to overcome it with work; with perseverance we will overcome it. In term of a pupil with difficulties, with SEN, I also believe that he will overcome many difficulties but I believe there is a threshold that might be a lot more difficult to overcome because of his physical constraints. (Year 4 teacher, Physalis School)
[the students who are not eligible for SEN support] it’s what we consider more difficulties in learning, because there’re two things, there are difficulties in learning [dificuldades de aprendizagem] which is this situation, very often the lack of a well-structured family, lack of schedules, the method, the organisation, the responsibility, the attention. And there’s learning difficulties, and these are those that involve [comprometimento] something more physical, or psychological, in this sometimes it’s not only the physical, it’s not just a physical limitation, but also intellectual, in terms of... when there’s hyperactivity disorders, relationship problems, that’s already another field, but the others [non-SEN] it is also very often lack of work. (Special education teacher, Pelican school)

From the three quotes above, we can identify several key aspects of how difference is constructed by the teachers interviewed, I will now summarise and analyse those key aspects:

- an implicit comparative nature of labels;
- a distinction between and different status assigned to health-related difficulties and ‘other’ difficulties;
- a key role played by the ICF/ICF-CY in the conceptualisation of SEN, eligibility to SEN support;
- different definitions of what is SEN held by teachers and special education teachers;
- an attempt to explain the reasons for difficulties
- the impact of legislation

The comparative nature of labels is visible when teachers make comments such as 'taking into account the other pupils, this one stands out negatively and for this reason I believe he has SEN' or 'SEN implies some physical, psychological or intellectual limitation whereas the group of students included in the DN 5/2005 group can overcome their difficulties though work and the reason for their difficulties is lacking something as a structured family, or perseverance'. The comparisons are also made over time as the Primula Year 5 teacher made clear when commenting that one of her pupils
was considered exceptional nowadays, whereas he would be considered 'normal, what in the past would be normal'.

In the six schools that took part in the study there was a clear dichotomous divide between 'students with special educational needs' [necessidades educativas especiais – NEE] and students with ‘educational needs’ or ‘difficulties in learning’ which could not be linked to ‘health-related problems’ and were not thought to be on a long-term basis. This dichotomous view distinguished between health-related difficulties (with an existing label such as ADHD) and ‘the other’ difficulties. It is a perspective influenced by a medical model viewpoint which is enhanced by two factors: on one hand, the fact that a medical statement is critical for students to be eligible for special education support, and on the other hand, the major role assumed by the WHO International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (WHO 2001; 2007a).

In all schools medical statements were mentioned by teachers and special education teachers. When pupils were identified, usually by the class teacher, as potentially 'having SEN' a process of trying to 'see if the pupil has special needs' was initiated. This implied an assessment by the special education teacher or team and in most cases asking parents to have the child assessed by a doctor to obtain a statement. Some teachers explained how this medical statement had to be obtained by parents though the family GP or a specialist; and how in most cases the use ICF language was required. The Decree-Law 3/2008 which regulates eligibility to special education is based on the ICF and presents a rather medical language. For example, this policy document specifies that for any pupil to be eligible to receive special education support and to be considered to 'have SEN' he or she needs to have a permanent, health-related problem. So, the group of pupils that is considered to have learning difficulties or SEN, are generally pupils who
comply with the eligibility criteria presented on the previously mentioned Decree-law.

In some cases the mainstream teachers felt the pupils had SEN or learning difficulties and needed something extra but the special education teachers reported that they did not have ‘enough problems’ to be eligible under the new legislation (DL 3/2008). Special education teachers appeared to act as gatekeepers who controlled access to special education support.

Furthermore, the ICF was named when special education teachers justified why only some students were eligible for 'SEN support'. For example, the special education teacher from Pelican school stated that ‘the ICF checklist is used and 3 or 4 qualifiers have to be used for students to be ‘special education pupils’ (An example of an ICF checklist is presented in Appendix 21). When the outcome of the special education assessment was negative (which is commonly referred to as a ‘student not belonging to the 3’), the pupil would usually be considered to be included under the DN 50/2005. In this case, pupils were perceived as different by their teachers as they had difficulties but they would not receive extra support or adaptations in their learning process through ‘special education’ because the national policy did not consider them eligible for such. The class teachers would be advised by the special education team to create a Recovery Plan (See three examples of Recovery Plan ‘forms’ in Appendices 23, 24, and 25).

This other group of students identified as being different were usually eligible to ‘receive something different or extra’ under the legislative order 50/2005, these were often referred to as pupils with difficulties in learning, who did ‘not have anything wrong in themselves’ that justified the difficulties but were reported to have either 'lack of interest/ attention/ effort/ commitment' or have some external factors that impact negatively on their learning (e.g. ‘a complicated life’, Portuguese not being their first language).
In many cases, the teachers expressed a feeling of 'unjustified', almost 'illegitimate' difficulties presented by students included in this group.

There appeared to be an underlying assumption that students with SEN had within-child factors that justified their difficulties and made them 'legitimate' difficulties. On the other hand, in the case of pupils who had difficulties not considered ‘SEN’, these were explained by a 'lack of something'. Examples of this are as lack of parental support or family structure (e.g. Raquel), lack of foundations or gaps in knowledge (e.g. Diana), lack of attention (e.g. Paulo), lack of commitment (e.g. Catarina), or motivation. These were sometimes associated to pupils’ age or belonging to certain ethnic groups (Alberto). This process created a situation of teachers finding themselves identifying 'who to blame' for the perceived difficulties, rather than just coming up with explanations for the difficulties.

So, there seemed to be two types of difficulties depending on its 'aetiology' or explanation offered by teachers: those 'legitimate' which are usually linked to recognisable (and recognised) disabilities (e.g. ASD, ADHD, physical disability, hearing or visual impairment). The other type are the 'illegitimate' difficulties of the students under the DN 50/2005, as described earlier. The existence of two different pieces of legislation, which involve different responses for the two groups, might be seen as underpinning this divide in the underlying assumptions held by teachers. In other words, the fact that pupils covered by the DL 3/2008 are assessed by a 'specialist' team entitled to have other modules, other forms of assessment, other curricula whereas pupils from the 50/2005 are expected to follow the mainstream curriculum and assessment, constructs two 'types of difference'. Pupils from the 50/2005 are 'normal pupils' with difficulties, while pupils from the 3/2008 are 'legitimately different'.
Finally, there is little permeability between the two groups which strongly contributes to the existing binary system. Given the more strict and permanent nature of the 'SEN', it implies that it is hard for pupils to be eligible but also once a student is considered eligible he or she is unlikely to be removed from that '3' label group.

It was clear in all schools that unless pupils have a visible, obvious disability, they will not be identified during the first year of primary school. In most cases this is because the teachers think 'it is still too early'. One of the teachers explained that the reason for this is 'to safeguard the pupil, the pupil’s situation because we never know how they’ll evolve, they may get worse, they may get better' (Head of Year 5F, Pelican school).

The specific individual curriculum (CEI) is perceived as being a 'serious' label that impacts on the pupils' future, because it has a strong connotation with a severe (learning) disability. According to one of the special education teachers interviewed the CEI are applied to students who are 'highly dependent', who have 'multiple disabilities' and students whose 'limitation is so big so big that we know by experience that they will learn something, but what is requested for a job, with responsibility, they will not achieve, and it's a frustration to everyone'

a ‘CEI pupil’ will maybe never do computer programming but if I tell him to fill in that board or that table, if he’s trained to do that, he can do it, right? Or if he has to answer the phone, or organize a folder, all of that they..... but the other part... or learning something, a structured activity, I don't know, sometimes they have... I don't know, being a gardener, isn't it? Or school site staff' (Pelican school, special education teacher)

**Being eligible for special education support**

Teachers hoped that pupils who had difficulties would be accepted for special education support. Especially in 1st cycle school, the teachers’
‘struggle’ to get support from special education seemed quite paradoxical since most teachers were very critical of the levels of support available for pupils ‘with SEN’. In most cases it meant getting support roughly once a week up to 1h out of the classroom with a special education teacher. In some cases, this ‘struggle’ could also be linked to the ‘anguish and guilt’ felt by teachers (e.g. Raquel’s Year 1/2 teacher, Physalis school) when they were not able to ‘solve the problem’ of their pupils having difficulties:

I feel a lot of anguish when I think about the class. I am very worried, seriously. Because all in all if they don't achieve, it's my fault. I’m failing, and this really distresses me deeply. Because they have been for a year and a half with me, just me and this makes me very anxious.

Being identified as ‘having SEN’ would provide the explanation for the difficulties and also create the hope that by having someone different explain the same things the pupils will overcome their difficulties.

However, in many cases like Raquel and Ricardo, since their difficulties could not be attributed to ‘health problems’ they will not be eligible. Social and behaviour issues and those related to mental health are not considered to be SEN and are not normally responded to by the schools. Pedro was one of the pupils that consistently, both his Year 4 and his Year 5 head of class teacher thought should ‘be 3/2008’. Pedro presented difficulties in Portuguese and considerable gaps in knowledge but the attention problems were what concerned his Year 4 teacher who identified him to be assessed by the special education team. The outcome of this process was that the pupil did not have special educational needs. His transition to the 2nd cycle was very difficult, he cried for his mother and did not want to stay in school, he had 6 negative grades on the first term (the only two positive grades were Arts and Music). The head of Year 5 teacher interviewed reported that Pedro was extremely quiet and only related to two pupils ‘like him’, that he was not
able to copy anything from the blackboard and was not able to follow the mainstream class but he was still not ‘accepted under the 3/2008’.

**Explaining difficulties**

There were three main factors commonly held responsible for the perceived difficulties: these were the parents/family, the pupil/pupil characteristics or the teachers/previous teachers.

Firstly, the pupils’ family background is usually considered by teachers when trying to understand the pupils’ difficulties, so for example, the fact that Raquel was abandoned by her mother, that Alexandre lives in care and that Isabel’s parents are getting divorced are considered key factors by the teachers but this does not usually entail any differences in practice other than being more understanding (or ignoring certain things as when Raquel does not bring her completed homework). For example, when describing Ricardo, a pupil who was not learning at the same pace as his peers, his Year 1 teacher referred to the his poor life conditions and low level of education of his mother:

> Ricardo is a boy who lives with his mother. The mother has the third grade, so she has a very low education, poor work, most of the time she’s unemployed, also she does not know very well how to read, if you had given this piece of paper she’d say I’ll sign you fill it in. (...) it is very complicated, and what can I do ... then they live in a social housing estate (Physalis Y1 teacher)

Ricardo did not receive support from special education and the same teacher when interviewed in the second year commented on how lucky she was because one of the visiting speech and language therapists was doing a psychology degree and was ‘using’ that pupil as a case study. The teacher expected that through the tests and reports of this training psychologist she would be able to identify the pupil for special education support.
An extreme case of the family being identified as the main explanation for a pupil’s difficulties is the case of Leonardo. He has been retained and made repeat Year 2 three times (2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08), he has been identified as having SEN and has an IEP where it states that he is significantly below average in cognition. The pupil receives support from special education. However, according to the special education teacher he was not born with disability, he had a social/ emotional problem, linked to his dysfunctional family. According to this specialised teacher the family live on state benefits, and 'they all sleep together, it's all very promiscuous'. Both the special education teacher and the Year 4 teacher mentioned the negative impact of the family:

I believe that his [Leonardo] main difficulty, he has in fact a medical report that defines him below the average cognitively, but I think that, for me, that's not his biggest, that's something that worries me but... I think it's the lack of interest, lack of meaning the school has for him, I believe the school for him is a world that doesn't mean...... doesn't mean much. So... I think it has a lot to do with the family issue, because he hasn't...... he lives in a very complicated family, and so, it's making him understand that the school is important and that it's very important, I think what he's learning (aprendizagens) is not meaningful, so he gives up. (Y4 Physalis)

This [Leonardo] is a case that if, that is my opinion, I cannot say much but it is a case that if he had a functional family, he probably would never be in special education, would never have move to a 'CEI', from curriculum adaptations. If he had a normal family... normal, healthy. The way it is, is..., nobody wants to work, nobody wants to do..., he’s not stimulated, he hasn’t evolved, he end up with a severe disability because he’s 12, he’s at a Year 2 level, he’s in a Year 4 class but he’s at Year 2 level. (Physalis Special education teacher)

I believe it’s lack of limits, lack of rules, he’s immature, childish and also a bit insecure but he isn't disabled (Physalis Special education teacher)
So, in this case, the eligibility for special support is linked to the student having a medical report stating he is academically below average, even if the explanations provided by teachers are family-related.

In some cases, the parents are mentioned in a sort of differential diagnosis way: i.e. Paulo has difficulties despite having interested and committed parents, so there must be ‘something else causing the problem’.

In other cases, the family is also not seen as the source of the difficulties, but these are linked to the pupils themselves:

For example Madalena, her parents are impeccable, young, very engaged. But she is very childish, very playful, very... I don’t know. (Y5 teacher Primula school)

Age-related aspects such as being immature or childish were brought up by teachers as negative characteristics of pupils and one of the possible explanations for some of the difficulties in learning. This was mentioned by teachers of all age groups (Years 1, 2, 4, and 5), and contrasted with what were believed to be health-related characteristics, which despite causing difficulties in learning did not have the ‘negative’ meaning attached. I will elaborate on this distinction in Section 5.1.2, p.141.

Furthermore, certain ethnic origins and nationalities were also associated by teachers with a rather negative connotation in terms of school success; this is the case for Roma and Brazilian pupils. For example when asked about factors that contributed to how pupils learnt, the head of Year 5H (Pelican school) immediately mentioned that the instability of the class could be linked to the high numbers of pupils from Roma ethnicity in her class, and the difficulties and lack of commitment from Brazilian pupils.

Similarly to what was observed when describing Raquel and mentioning she is 7 years old, saying Barton is ‘foreigner’ and Alberto is of Rom ethnicity,
teachers tended to mention some aspects only when they judged them as relevant, and this seemed to be the case when those characteristics were different from those of the majority.

Finally, teachers or previous (poor) teaching was also mentioned to justify pupils' difficulties. For example the Year 5 teacher at Primula school expressed the feeling of frustration throughout her interview regarding the students' lack of basic knowledge and what she saw as the irresponsibility of 1st cycle school teachers in allowing them to progress to Year 5 and secondary school.

*Same pupil, different conceptualisations*

The change of school involved being seen in a different context and sometimes in a different way, as it was described in Paulo's case above. Arlete was another case of this transition change, in Year 4 she 'had difficulties in Portuguese, more specifically with writing'. However, in Year 5 she only had negative grades in History, Music and Mathematics. Maria and Catarina were described as being very similar pupils by their Year 4 teacher, both pupils participated very little in class, did not have opinions or initiative, the teacher explained how she had to move their seats because they would produce work that was exactly the same (e.g. identical drawings). The teacher explained that Catarina was progressing slightly more than Maria. When in Year 5, Maria was described as being 'impeccable, hardworking, participative, tidy and interested', whereas Catarina was described as being 'lazy, having negative grades and not being interested or worried about school'. The only thing in common in the Year 5 teacher's description was the fact that both pupils were quiet. Similarly, Madalena worried the Year 4 teacher for her lack of interest and taste for Mathematics despite of her great potential and when in Year 5 the teacher did not
understand why she would have been identified as she had no problems or difficulties.

In some cases, three different sources show three different perspectives of a pupil. Frederico who was diagnosed as having 'Autism/Asperger’s' was considered problematic by his Year 4 teacher as she did not know what he was capable of because he would only 'work under pressure', in other words in 'exam' situation. Frederico's IEP showed a different perspective, the pupil had been retained three times in Year 2, he had been followed by a psychologist out of school since Year 1 because of his difficulties in reading and writing. The pupil was being medicated for his attention problems and epilepsy and his mother was diagnosed with clinical depression. When Frederico’s Year 5 head of class teacher (History) was interviewed she reported that all his grades were level 3 (on a scale of 1 to 5), and so although he was under the DL 3/2008, he followed all the mainstream classes and could be considered an average pupil.

Similarly Bruno was described by his Year 4 teacher as a pupil with dyslexia, attention problems, difficulties in Mathematics and emotionally very needy. The pupil had an IEP where it was stated that he was a 'high risk' pupil because of his background (lived in care and was now with a foster family), he was followed by a hospital psychiatry service since he was 3 years old and was diagnosed with ‘Reactive disinhibited attachment disorder of childhood’ and severe psychomotor development disorder. When followed up in Year 5 Bruno was described as a pupil who did not like school, did not want to work in class, who was becoming aggressive towards colleagues and teachers. These different perspectives raise questions as to what the school should be doing to support Bruno. In Year 4, his special education personalised support plan focused on visual and auditory perception, verbal comprehension and reasoning, reading, writing, memory (visual, verbal,
numerical), mental Mathematics, and abstract reasoning. The interviewed Year 5 teacher felt he needed to do something different as he would never go to university. In February, after five months in Year 5, his IEP was still being elaborated by the special education team and according to the head of class 'the school had to find competencies that he would be able to attain because, as he was covered by the DL 3/2008, if he did not achieve it would be the teachers' fault'.

The mismatch between pupils' ‘needs’ and schools’ responses

In some cases there was a misalignment or a perceived lack of fit between what the problems and perceived needs were (e.g. behaviour problem, social difficulty) and the school's responses (e.g. extra support in Portuguese, taking medication for attention problems). Frederico is an example of this, as one of his Year 5 teachers reported that he was taking drugs for his attention problems but that in her opinion his difficulties were social. And this situation is also applicable to Raquel who had 'emotional and behaviour problems' and received extra support in Portuguese. Also, when pupils were not able to follow their peers, like Alberto, there was a sense of 'having to fill their time' which raises concerns as to the appropriateness of the planning and activities proposed (e.g. copy from the blackboard, go to the library/resource centre ‘independently’).
6.2 School level

As previously mentioned, since 2004/2005 all schools in Portugal are organised into clusters with other local schools for leadership and management reasons. Pupils are expected to progress within the schools of one cluster from kindergarten, to the 1st cycle school (Y1-4) and 2nd and 3rd cycle school (Y5-9). Most of the schools that took part in the study belonged to two school clusters – one of them headed by the Pelican school which includes the Peacock 1st cycle school. The other headed by the Primula school and including the Physalis 1st cycle school (See Table 12 below for a summary of the schools’ details). I will now present two school vignettes to illustrate the type of information collected during the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Phase of Education</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacock School</td>
<td>1st cycle (Y1-4)</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican School</td>
<td>2nd and 3rd cycles (Y5-9)</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasant School</td>
<td>2nd and 3rd and secondary (Y5-12)</td>
<td>11 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot School</td>
<td>2nd and 3rd cycles (Y5-9)</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physalis School</td>
<td>Kindergarten and 1st cycle (Y1-4)</td>
<td>3 – 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primula School</td>
<td>2nd and 3rd cycles (Y5-9)</td>
<td>– 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 - Phase of education and age range for Peacock, Pelican, Pheasant and Parrot schools and Physalis and Primula schools

6.2.1 School vignette: Pelican cluster of schools

Characterisation of the school cluster

The Pelican 2nd and 3rd cycle school was the head of a cluster of schools of which the Peacock 1st cycle school is part of. Additionally, these two schools had been co-located since 2007/2008 due to delays in the reconstruction of the 1st cycle school building. In 2011-2012 the Pelican school cluster had in total 1508 pupils, of which:

- 135 in pre-school,
- 658 in the 1st cycle (27 classes) (of which 5 classes in Peacock school),
- 415 in the 2nd cycle (16 classes) and,
- 300 in the 3rd cycle (12 classes).

The Pelican school had a partnership [ensino articulado] with a local dance school, which some pupils would attend for some of the subjects (e.g. instead of having PE at school they had dance) (Inspeção-Geral da Educação 2012). The school also had partnerships with a local sports club, a sailing club and an equestrian centre where some pupils covered by the DL 3/2008 would go for adapted swimming, sailing and therapeutic horse riding. The school cluster also had sporadic contact with medical staff and a local rehabilitation hospital that followed some pupils with physical disabilities. Within the school the ‘BECRE’ (library and educational resources centre) and the ‘SPO’ (psychology and orientation service) were important structures for the special education team at Pelican school. At this school pupils with ‘specific individual curriculum’ had activities such as ‘support to the dining hall’ (preparing pouches with a napkin, fork, knife and spoon) with a view to ‘facilitate a future transition to active life’.

According to a report produced by the school for an external assessment by the Ministry of Education, the Pelican school is located in a heterogeneous area, in which most of the population was Portuguese, but there were also some ethnic minorities. Most residents are employees, workforce, and unqualified workers with precarious jobs.

The same report states that the aim of the school was ‘being a home of culture, learning and affection for all students’; it also had a ‘strong concern for citizenship’. It was a well-known school in terms of ‘didactic-pedagogic innovation, implementing projects and experiences in including and supporting ‘problematic’ students’. The school was concerned with ‘drugs
prevention and integration of students of Luso-African descent (families originating from African countries which were Portuguese ex-colonies, i.e. Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe), valuing and spreading their traditions’. It also worked to ‘support students from other nationalities (Brazil, Moldavia, Ukraine, Romania, Belorussia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Peru and China)’ (Source: School report)

Moreover, the 2012 inspection report states that the school population had 16% pupils from ‘other countries’, and that there was a predominance of Brazilian pupils. The report recalled that 66.4% did not receive Education social benefits [Ação Social Escolar]. 83% of the pupils had a computer and access to the internet. Regarding the parents’ education, 37.5% had completed the Year 9, 31% secondary education (Year 12) and 31% had attended higher education. The school cluster had 129 teachers, and a psychologist. The inspection found that the pupils with special needs and those ‘who arrived from other countries’ were well integrated in the school because they were welcome and supported. The Pelican cluster had a well-established and efficient system of sharing information in transition moments between the schools of the cluster. The report stated that the teachers were good at identifying learning difficulties in the pupils, and that the school was effective at mobilising resources for pupils with SEN, providing adequate responses pupils’ issues and individual needs. Differentiation should however be applied to pupils with ‘exceptional learning abilities’ by designing development plans.

Based on statistics provided by the Pelican’s Special Education Teacher/Coordinator, the Table 4 shows the basic figures for SEN pupils at the Pelican school cluster: those considered eligible under the DL 3/2008 (n=56), of which some were supported by the one of the four special education
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teachers (n= 26), some had an individual curriculum (n=9) and the others received indirect support (n=21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>DL 3/2008</th>
<th>Direct support</th>
<th>Indirect support</th>
<th>CEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st cycle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd cycle</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd cycle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 - 2010 statistics for the total number of pupils covered by the Decree-Law 3/2008

**Special education and other types of individual planning**

The procedures for identification and assessment of students’ ‘needs’ are well described by national policy, thus there little or no variation between schools in terms of these systems and procedures. Likewise, the types of planning documents used are described in national policy. At the Pelican school cluster four main types of planning were mentioned: IEPs, specific individual curricula, Recovery/ catch up plans, and Follow up/ chaperone plans. Each pupil identified as possibly ‘having SEN’ would have firstly, a technical-pedagogical report (See Appendix 20) and an ICF checklist (Appendix 21) as a result of the assessment by the special education team, and finally only the pupils covered by the DL 3/2008 would have an IEP as the outcome of this procedure.

At this cluster of schools, the technical-pedagogical report (Vitor’s report is presented in Appendix 20) consisted of a four-page document that summarised the description of the pupil’s functioning profile and the decision made of whether the pupil’s case required intervention from the special education. This report had to be signed by the parent or carer. If the pupil did not need intervention from special education the technical-pedagogical report identified the DN 50/2005 and the DN 1/2006 as other
types of support offered by the school. If the pupil needed specialised intervention from special education, the articles 17 to 22 of the DL 3/2008 were mentioned. The second document used was the ICF checklist (Appendix 21), which presented ICF-CY items from the body functions section only (i.e. b110 - b780) and required a decision on a 0-4 scale what best described the pupil: zero which means 'no disability', to four being a 'complete disability', 8 should be used when there is no information, and 9 when it is not applicable.

The IEP was to be developed based on a form which at the Pelican cluster was relatively short (5 pages), and had to be signed by the school board and the pupil’s parent or carer. It presented:

- a summary of the school and personal life;
- the functioning profile which is formulated using ICF language and presented a list of:
  - problems of body functions (e.g. attention, memory),
  - limitations in activities and participation (reading, writing, focusing attention, thinking, making decisions...), and
  - facilitators (e.g. close family, friends, health professionals);
- the list of adaptations to be implemented (referring to the relevant articles of the DL 3/2008);
- a reminder for teachers to attach a transition plan if relevant;
- a list of staff members responsible for the implementation of the IEP;
- the measures for the implementation and evaluation of the IEP
- a list of all who were involved in designing the IEP

The teachers gave me a general sense that IEPs were not very useful on a daily basis for teaching. For example, when asked about its usefulness the Year 4 teacher at Peacock 1st cycle school stated that IEPs are not useful on a
daily basis, they get 'taken out of the cupboard’ for the end of term when assessment reports have to be made.

At the Pelican cluster, there is a form linked to the DN 50/2005 that applies to Recovery/ catch up plans, Follow up/ chaperone plans and Development plans (in Appendix 23). Contrarily to IEPs it does not hold any personal information on the student and it should to be completed by the class teacher only. The form consists of a checklist with possible:

- in-class differentiation strategies;
- study/ support strategies;
- remedial activities;
- specific Portuguese learning activities for students from foreign countries.

6.2.2 Looking across schools: responding to difference

For the other ones we can’t do many adaptations, if they’re not under any legislation. This case is a specific case so we adapt everything to the pupil (Pelican school, head of Year 5B)

This section focuses on how Portuguese schools respond to pupils who are perceived as different and in need of something different. It is composed of two main parts: Planning, and Provision. In terms of provision data is organised into three themes: firstly I will focus on the concepts of 'class group' which seems to be used by all teachers as a unit; secondly, I will address the issues of assessment, testing and failing which appear to be relevant in the process of both construction and responding to difference; and finally, I will concentrate on the interventions and resources mentioned by teachers in the interviews. The quote above was chosen because it shows the key role of policy, formal identification and classification of pupils for the teachers and schools in Portugal to respond to pupil’s ‘needs’. I should add
however, that all pupils are now entitled to attend 'supported study' classes in the 1st cycle schools and that there is usually support made available for pupils with negative grades in the 2nd and 3rd cycle schools, both of these forms of support are not linked to either the DL 3/2008 or the DN 50/2005 and they do not involve individual planning.

When do schools and teachers act?

The number of students identified as needing additional or different provision in Year 1 was in both cases lower than 6 (the maximum established for this study). Two pupils were identified by teachers at Peacock primary (vs. 6 selected in Year 4) and four in Physalis primary (vs. 6 selected in Year 4). None of these Year 1 pupils were receiving support from special education at the time of data collection, nor did they have formal IEPs or recovery plans. Nonetheless, in reality, even though none of the pupils in Year 1 selected by their teachers to be studied actually had a formal individual plan some of them had been formally identified by their teachers to be assessed by the special education team. Even if the general understanding was that Year 1 it was too early to put something in place to respond to the pupils’ difficulties, regardless of these being already quite marked and likely to become more and more accentuated as it was the case of Alexandre, Raquel, and Ricardo. This is in line with the guidelines presented in national educational policy. The Year 4 teacher at Peacock school expressed that 'there are several views on this topic and that some people still think that Year 2 is too soon'.

However, another aspect which needs to be taken into account is the lengthy route between a teacher identifying a pupil and the final decision from the special education teacher/team. The process of identifying students 'for special education support' is generally initiated by teachers when they feel
the pupil is 'struggling', policy states that it can however, also be initiated by parents or doctors/ GPs. Even when the procedure for getting support from special education is initiated in Year 1, it is common for this highly bureaucratic process to only be resolved in the second half of Year 2, and the cases of Alexandre and Helio are examples of this. The difficulties in learning shown in Year 1, in most cases became accentuated in Year 2. Exceptions to this are pupils who had specific difficulties, for example Isabel’s speech difficulties that had an impact on her spelling but did not become worse over the two-year period. Coincidentally, this was one of the few students attending Speech and Language Therapy outside of the school at the time of the first interview.

This highly bureaucratic ethos goes to the extent of a teacher who realises that a pupil would need something different from the majority because Portuguese is not his first language, does not know if she can ‘legally’ design a recovery plan as that could be seen as ‘penalising the pupil for his language’ skills. That was the case of Barton referred by the teacher as ‘a foreigner’ who came from Romania and joined the class in Year 2 with very little Portuguese knowledge. Furthermore, Raquel’s teacher illustrates well the weight of bureaucracy and of having the right documents to be eligible for special education support as she mentions that the medical report provided by the grandmother will not help because it is ‘too psychological’ and does not use ICF-based language.
Chapter 6: Individual planning in Portuguese schools

**Planning**

My class planning doesn't change! From the student with SEN... I can't demand the same things, the same contents (Parrot school, Year 5 teacher)

This statement reflects a general trend observed in the schools in Portugal, which is that teachers prepare one plan for the whole class and then for the pupils who cannot follow that plan they will adjust, often by expecting less and demanding less. Apart from that whole class plan there are two other types of plan in use in the schools that took part in this study – IEPs and Recovery/ catch up plans.

IEPs are required for pupils included in the DL 3/2008, and they are described in this national policy as the 'document that determines and explains the educational responses and forms of assessment'. The format of these documents is to be approved by the school board but it must include 11 items stipulated by law:

- identification of pupil;
- summary of school and other relevant history;
- functional profile;
- environmental factors: barriers and facilitators;
- educational responses;
- contents, aims, strategies, human resources;
- level of participation in school activities;
- time allocation;
- responsible 'technicians';
- process of IEP implementation evaluation
Figure 7 presents the components of all IEPs at Primula cluster of schools, it consists of a long document (of approximately ten pages, check Error! Reference source not found.). It consists of a lengthy characterisation of the student from various perspectives (academic history, medical history, family/social context) and a list, rather disorganized, of responses to the student’s difficulties (changes in support levels, curriculum, assessment, resources, and services).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information on the student/difficulties</th>
<th>Responses (Aims, strategies, services, staff responsible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Summary of <strong>school history</strong> (early intervention, preschool, 1st, 2nd and 3rd cycle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summary of <strong>clinical/psychological information</strong> (family, social/cultural background, external services involved, ...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relevant information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Functioning profile (body function, activity and participation, environmental factors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Characterisation of pupils’ knowledge and difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educational responses and specific education measures to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 17 Personalised learning support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 18 Individual curriculum adaptations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 19 School enrolment adaptation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 20 Assessment process adaptations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 21 Individual specific curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Art 22 Assistive technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content, general and specific <strong>aims</strong>, and <strong>strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human and material <strong>resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pupil’s <strong>level of participation</strong> in the schools’ educational activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other activities/ <strong>services received</strong> by the pupil (SLT, psychological support, support from social worker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual transition plan (end of compulsory schooling only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time allocation of activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specific assessment criteria for art 16 e) – specific individual curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Staff responsible</strong> for educational responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment of IEP implementation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 - IEP “form” from Primula cluster of schools
IEPs are expected to be developed by three stakeholders: the class teacher (in 1st cycle school) or the head of class (from the 2nd cycle), the special education teacher and the parents/guardians. However, in most cases the communication between mainstream teachers and special education teachers is very limited. The Year 4 teacher at Physalis school mentioned how the school should create more communication opportunities because mainstream teachers are in class all day and after school 'the special education teacher either goes home or has meetings with the special education team and so the only moments for communication are informally on break times and formally at the end of each term to assess the work developed.

Catch up plans are the responsibility of the class teacher. In 2nd and 3rd cycle school, catch up plans must be created for students who have fail grades at 3 or more subjects. Using the words of one of the interviewed special education teachers 'special education is a resource to the school – it can help with strategies for ‘the 50 students’ – but it’s the school, head of class, and the teachers' responsibility (Pelican special education teacher). Usually school clusters have standard forms for both IEPs and recovery plans that are to be used by all teachers in all schools (See Appendix 23, 22, and 23). At the Physalis 1st cycle school the recovery/catch up plan is a longer document and presents a learning profile of the pupil (organised into 'difficulties diagnosed' and capacities), strategies (adopted by the school, proposed to the pupil, and to the parent/carer), resources (support teacher, computer......), partnerships (speech therapist, social worker...). It is presented to and signed by the student and the parent/carer and according to the Year 4 teacher interviewed at Physalis School it aims to achieve a higher level of commitment from both.
Some teachers mentioned follow up/ chaperone plans [acompanhamento] for students who had been made repeat a year, however, none of the pupils identified for this study had this type of plan. Additionally, none of the interviewed teachers were using or had used ‘development plans’ for students with ‘exceptional capacities for learning’, plans that were also presented in the same piece of legislation (Despacho Normativo n.º 50/2005).

Depending on the schools, catch up and follow up plans present more or less detailed information on the pupils.

The Year 4 teacher at Physalis 1st cycle school expressed the she could have one pupil, ‘who’s very good’ with a development plan but she did not feel the need to do it because the student always requires something extra but it would mean ‘just formalising something that is already taking place’.

**Provision**

*Class group as a unit*

Each class has its own personality (Pelican school, Head of Year 5B)

In all the schools that took part in the study, the class group of students was presented as a unit. ‘Good classes’ were those with well-behaved students, who learned easily. On the other hand, heterogeneous classes are described as complicated. One of the reasons for this is that heterogeneity is associated to the existence of pupils who 'have difficulties and find it difficult to learn’ (Pheasant school, head of Year 5C). In some cases there appears to be an homogeneous group of students with difficulties, for example the Year 5 teacher at the Pheasant school mentioned how two students would be moved into another class by the end of the academic year because:

they’re completely different from the rest of the class: they are really good students, they shouldn’t be there, it’s not bad for them
to come into contact with other realities but maybe then for their own development it’s best to be in another class.

So, it is clear that this teacher felt that ‘good’ students learn something from being in class with ‘pupils with difficulties’, however, they need to be in a more homogeneous group to learn and ‘develop’. This contrasts with statements made in school policy, for example at Primula school that imply that the challenges of pupil diversity are responded to through inclusive practices in inclusive classrooms:

The socio-economic and cultural background of the school population is quite heterogeneous, which creates extremely dynamic challenges to staff. These challenges are synonym of inclusive practices in which the main concern is to create a multicultural school with diverse opportunities. One of the characteristics of this school is that the classrooms are inclusive so we work in close collaboration with the special education group who works with 84 students covered by the Decree-Law 3/2008. (Primula 2nd and 3rd cycle school report)

The expectation of having homogeneous classes can also be linked to the use of textbooks. These play a key role in most classrooms; parents are expected to buy the books at the beginning of the academic year. For example Portuguese language books present texts and then questions about the text, and usually some form of grammar exercises. The expectation that all pupils in the classroom will read the same texts and do the same activities does not promote differentiated practices. Differentiation in class very often takes the shape of extra attention from the teacher, extra time to complete (the same) tasks or fewer tasks to be completed (e.g. only the 2 first questions). In some cases the teachers reported having to create materials (hand-outs, photocopies from other books) for the students who were not able to follow the book at the same pace as the rest of the class. The majority of teachers felt that this was however an exception and considered it a burdensome ‘extra
chore’. The presence of students covered by the Law 3/2008 requires a decrease in student numbers in the class.

Assessment, testing and failing

Assessment and changes in tests and testing procedures were mentioned by all teachers as a key aspect of responding to student diversity. Common responses in terms of assessment were that pupils with SEN had different tests, usually covering the same contents but in a different way (e.g. shorter questions), pupils would also have more time to complete tests or could be withdrawn from the classroom to do the tests with support from the special education teacher. This is justified by the head of Year 5C at Pheasant school, that by having less pupils and also being used to work with those SEN pupils 'she can explain better’. Teachers also have different marking criteria (e.g. spelling errors are not penalised). Most teachers mentioned the decision to 'make the tests easier' so that everyone could do the same test. The Year 5 teacher interviewed at Parrot school explained that as a consequence of this the 'very good' pupils feel discouraged. The teacher interviewed at Pheasant school explained how the head of school tried and had difficulties convincing teachers that from the following year no tests would be made and that pupils would be assessed based on their work and participation in classes, their behaviour, attendance, and punctuality.

Most teachers commented on the fact that it was almost impossible to fail pupils and the requirement to extensively document and justify the 'need to fail a pupil'. This is less the case at the end of each cycle, in other words, pupils were expected to follow their class during the cycle and if they had not achieved the basic competencies of that stage, then they could be 'retained', if all the stakeholders agreed that that was on the best interest of the pupil. For students under DL 3/2008, if no alterations and no adapted tests were made (and no lower level competencies were selected for the
student to be able achieve) then it was considered that ‘the school and teacher failed’ and thus the pupil could not be retained – this was expressed by several teachers interviewed.

At the end of years 4, 6 and 9 there were national exams for the subjects of Portuguese and Mathematics (and Portuguese as an additional language); all students had to sit these exams apart from those with specific individual curricula (CEI), the special education teacher at Pelican school explained that ‘since these pupils do not follow the national curriculum, or most of it, given their severe limitations (...) they would receive a Year 9 certificate at the end of compulsory schooling’. The latter served to prove that the pupil attended compulsory school. Pupils under DL 3/2008 but without a CEI had to sit the exams but the papers should be adapted to their level and needs. However, also in the national exams there was an attempt by some teachers to make it homogeneous, because for each exam there needs to be a 1st and 2nd call versions and one alternative exam; so as the special education teacher at Pelican school explained if there are 3 pupils who need adapted exams, then the teacher needs to create 9 different exams and marking criteria, and this becomes too troublesome.

When referring to the need to do a recovery test for some students who had very low grades the head of Year 5H at Pelican school explained that ‘nowadays the kids don’t understand that they needs to study, to memorise, and this is the reality, that there doesn’t need to be any effort, no work, no need to know things by heart, you just need to be in school and in class’.

While on one hand some teachers, like the Year 5 teacher at Primula school, struggled to deal with the difficulty to retain pupils, stating that ‘some values are lost and everything is inconsequent, they pass’, ‘knowledge doesn't matter anymore and we just have to pass them’. This teacher claimed that the only two reasons for failing someone was lack of attendance or ‘not caring at
all about school’. On the other hand, teachers like the Year 4 teacher at Physalis School, struggled to deal with the fact that pupils who fail during 1st cycle school still followed the class, always on a different level, and that that created difficult issues in terms of pupil self-esteem.

So, pupil assessment and testing, and the subject of pupils being retained and made repeat an year if they did not acquire ‘the minimum competencies’ were all difficult issues that divided and brought up quite deep opinions in teachers. It was also a subject that accentuates the identity divide between pupils with SEN, and more specifically with specific individual curricula and all the other pupils, as mentioned in the previous section.

*Interventions and resources*

In terms of interventions all forms of extra support described by teachers entailed groups of pupils being taken out of the mainstream class by either a regular or a special education teacher, and the work developed rarely had a direct link to what was being done in the mainstream classroom. It was interesting to know that recovery classes (mainly for Portuguese language, mathematics and English) were made available in the 2nd and 3rd cycle schools (years 5-9) to the students, with or without recovery plans, who were struggling in class. They usually took place after the compulsory lessons and in some cases would have a link to what had been done in mainstream class (e.g. complete unfinished pages of the book or activity sheets). This happened because often the mainstream teachers were responsible for offering these extra sessions. At Pheasant school the head of Year 5C commented that students who attended 'recovery classes' had almost always one or two hours at the end of each day. This was not linked either to the DL 3/2008 or the DN 50/2005 and it did not necessarily mean that the pupils who attend were perceived as different or in need of something different or additional; sometimes half of the class would attend these sessions. So also in
terms of support there seemed to be a clear distinction between pupils covered by the DL3/2008 and those covered by the DN 50/2005:

Pupils under the DN 50/2005 are more left to their own fate [são deixados à mercê], to their own devices [deixados sua propria à mercê], they are more made accountable [responsabilisados]. Because there is no support we give them the responsibility, in other words, if you study, you'll get there, but they knew that already without having a recovery plan so what they have is extra work as homework or in class... and it's up to them and their parents to be responsible, because often if parents were a bit more present things would be a lot easier. (...) You failed because you didn't study, because you misbehaved, because... whatever reason, so you'll have extra work. (Pheasant school, head of Y5C)

the two ‘50’, it's whenever, don't ask me, it doesn't exist [a timetable] because the [support] teacher is the school coordinator and he supports pupils in several schools, so him I cannot tell you, it depends, he does several things at the same time. (Year 4 teacher at Peacock school)

Students under DN 50/2005 received more sporadic support and were 'made accountable' for their school success or failure whereas pupils with special needs were ‘followed by the special education team’ and could not have recovery plans or other support related to the DN 50/2005.

The special education [pupils] don't get extra work, they have activities that substitute the normal [activities], (...) because if they fail it’s because they can't do it' (Pheasant school, head of Year 5C)

Pupils 'with SEN', as indicated by the special education teacher at Pelican school, can have curriculum adaptations (e.g. selection of limited number of key competencies to be acquired, different subjects such as functional Sciences or Portuguese), special assessment (as described in the previous section) and extra support:

There are pupils with curriculum adaptations, with special assessment conditions and with support, they can have one or the
three; and then there’re the pupils with a specific individual curriculum (CEI). (Special education teacher, Pelican school)

The pupils with specific individual curricula in 2nd and 3rd cycle schools may spend large amounts of their days away from their mainstream class as they had most of the subjects out of the mainstream classroom, joining in only for some of the subjects such as arts, PE, or 'Formação Cívica'. An example of this was Alberto (Year 5, Pelican school). Apart from this exception, all pupils generally followed the class for most of the day. If we use the Figure 4(pg. 168) all the interventions can be placed on the lower right quadrant.

The decision of supporting students in groups seemed to be linked to practical aspects linked to the timetable of the support teacher:

I cannot do individual because I have all these pupils there [at Peacock school] and I go there twice [a week], so what I try to do is two by two. Because there’s one boy who is a CEI [Individual specific curriculum] so I need to give him a lot more support. (...) there are things that I need to do with all of them like attention development, when I do it I do for all of them, then I change according to each pupil’s needs. (Special Ed. teacher Pelican School)

Some teachers feel that the support from the special education teacher is not adequate. For example the Year 4 teach at Peacock 1st Cycle School talking about the withdrawal special education support ‘it interrupts, it interrupts takes the kids out, the class is also disturbed and then (...) if it was an interruption in which they would work on specific things. It would still be worth it... so, I’m not sure whether it is beneficial’.

The special education teachers also expressed the limitations of their role:

I go there once a week, I don’t teach him much do I? (Special Ed teacher Pelican School)

All the schools that took part in the study had some extra resources to respond to the students from the two groups previously mentioned (DN
Special education teachers and mainstream teachers were the two key human resources used by all schools. Pupils under DL 3/2008 were expected to have a team of special education teachers assess 'their needs', develop a functional profile according to the ICF, and then design an Individual Education Plan (PEI) or an specific individual curriculum (CEI) depending on the pupils' level of 'need'. In terms of provision these pupils when in primary school were supported by a special education teacher (usually once or twice a week, out of the mainstream classroom, in small groups). Whereas in secondary school pupils with specific individual curricula could be out of the mainstream class for most of the week as they have different subjects. On the other hand, for pupils under DN 50/2005 the class teacher was expected to have a catch up plan (in most cases a 1 page form with boxes to tick), which tended to use a quite negative/deficit language and was more an instrument to raise awareness of ‘the pupil’s difficulties’ and of the need for commitment, as well as delegating responsibility on pupils and parents. The extra support was delivered in small groups out of the mainstream classroom, by mainstream teachers, who very often were about to retire or had health problems that prevented them from mainstream teaching.

Additionally there were structures such as the 'GABE' (disciplinary support office), an office where pupils from Pheasant school went to 'receive punishments' (according to the head of Year 5 interviewed) and the 'BECRE' (school library and resource centre) at Pelican school. Aside from these structures, schools also made use of external resources and services such as Speech and Language Therapy, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, psychological counselling, psychology services. In some cases this was linked to a partnership between schools and the local Inclusion Resource
Centres [CRI]. The centres were usually ‘old’ special education institutions that were expected to behave as resource centres for mainstream schools.

External support, independent from the school, was quite common for a number of reasons: some parents who can afford to pay for external support sometimes prefer to do so, this could be linked to a lack of or limited types of support available at school, but also to some stigma of being identified as ‘3’. Additionally, when support was not available from the school (because pupils were not eligible for special education support) teachers advised to look for support elsewhere (private ‘clinics’).

6.3 Summary

In summary, this chapter presented the analysis of the findings from the interviews with teachers and the analysis of individual planning documents in Portugal. Similarly to Chapter 5, this chapter is started by focusing on the pupils and the practitioners’ conceptualisations of pupil diversity. I presented four case vignettes that illustrate the way teachers conceptualised and the way schools responded to pupil diversity. This was followed by a cross-case analysis of the conceptualisations of difference, which was presented as three themes: ‘Being eligible for special education support’, ‘Explaining difficulties’, and ‘The mismatch between pupils’ ‘needs’ and schools’ responses’.

This lead to a section focusing on the schools’ responses to pupil diversity, in the context of individual planning. The first part of this section presents a school vignette to illustrate in considerable depth the school context and the responses to pupil diversity. Subsequently, I look across the findings of all the schools and discuss the following themes: ‘When do schools and teachers act?’, ‘Planning’, and ‘Provision’. The later outlines three themes: ‘Class
group as a unit’, ‘Assessment, testing, and failing’, and ‘Interventions and resources’.

This chapter concludes the single country analysis of the findings and gives way to the cross-national comparisons of processes of individual planning and provision in England and Portugal.
Chapter 7: Looking across countries

Following on from the presentation of the findings from each country independently, this chapter presents a cross-national analysis, of similarities and differences between schools in England and in Portugal. This section uses the data from the two countries with a view to compare them and explore the factors that were in play in the process of conceptualising, constructing and responding to difference. Through this comparative analysis, and based on the emerging themes, I developed a theoretical model of how the process of conceptualising and managing difference appears to occur. This is presented on Figure 15 and is based on the overarching theory that conceptualisation and management of difference are two processes that impact on one another. In other words, who is identified as different and how it will influence the types of responses, for example interventions available. So, if a school has a pupil with reading difficulties it may plan a reading intervention. If there is a pupil in a wheelchair, the school may create accessible classrooms and toilets. However, the contrary is also applicable, the way difference is responded to, has an impact on how it is conceptualised. Responses to difference in the context of this study have two main aspects: planning and provision. The resources available in each school influence which pupils are identified as needing individual planning; and they also influence how these pupils are conceptualised. So, for example, if the school has a Speech and Language Therapist (e.g. Physalis/Primula cluster of schools) then more pupils may be identified as having Speech and Language Difficulties. Similarly, if the school organises a ‘booster group’ during assembly time (e.g. Eagle Primary), then children may end up being conceptualised as ‘booster children’. These processes are mediated by the existing educational policy, which often establishes the existence of resources
such as extra adult support. Furthermore, it also establishes the eligibility criteria of access those resources. This is done for example through the definition of the concept of SEN. The process of deciding who ‘needs’ individualised responses is also influenced by the individual teachers’ characteristics. Factors like the teachers’ experience of certain situations, their knowledge, and personality have an impact on how pupils’ ‘difficulties’ will be conceptualised and responded to.

7.1 Similarities

I will start by focusing on the main similarities in the processes of conceptualisation and management of difference in schools in England and Portugal. There are three main broad similarities, marked by some lower level differences, these are the definition of difference from the teachers’ perspective; the notion that certain pupils need different planning and different provision; and the influence of context – namely the impact of policy – on how difference is conceptualised and responded to.

7.1.1 Definition of difference from the teachers’ perspective

Pupils in the schools that took part in the study came from various ethnic and language backgrounds, from different social classes/socioeconomic status, and they brought into school diverse life experiences, religions and interests. However, when faced with this diversity, teachers only identified some pupils as ‘different’ – different, that is, in a way that impacted on their class planning and that called for individualised responses. Pupils who had characteristics that were problematic in relation to learning, pupils who ‘had difficulties’ were those teachers considered ‘different’. In other words, a commonality between Portugal and England when we refer to how the
notion of educational difference was constructed was the prevailing trend that teachers in both countries focused on the difficulties that some pupils had in learning, in the same ways and at the same pace as the majority of their peers. So, as presented in the previous two chapters, for example pupils with disabilities that did not impact on their learning, and pupils with English/Portuguese as an additional language to whom language was not a barrier to learning were not considered by teachers as ‘different’ in the sense of calling for individualised responses. This could be linked to the way the study was framed ‘being different’ as in ‘being in need of something different’.

It is interesting to note that, as we have seen, teachers identified a range of pupils with difficulties as being different. And despite the fact that there were forms of individual planning associated with ‘gifted and talented’ pupils, the conceptualisation of this group of pupils does not follow the same pattern. Pupils referred to as ‘gifted and talented’ or above average in England and as ‘pupils with exceptional learning capacities’ in Portugal did not seem to be perceived as different in this sense, even if teachers had to plan something different for them. The case of this group of pupils is very interesting in understanding how teachers build the notion of educational difference because teachers reported that these ‘exceptional’ students learnt all they were being taught and ‘needed’ something more. The teachers often had to propose activities that were different from the ones presented to the majority of the students. However, these were usually on top of the ‘regular’ ones. Thus these pupils were able to do the same as the majority and ‘just needed something extra’. This extra could be for example helping their peers as their ‘learning’ was not a cause of concern for the teachers. Their differences were not perceived as problematic, and therefore they were not
perceived as ‘different’ (Please refer to the diagram presented in Figure 8, p. 239).

7.1.2 The need for different planning and different provision

If we now concentrate on the notion that some pupils need different planning and different provision, this is a clear similarity between Portugal and England (See Table 14). Data presented in the previous chapters shows how in both countries schools use different planning for some pupils, namely individual education plans and different provision such as extra support. However, this phenomenon takes different forms.

In England all schools’ planning was expected to be differentiated for all pupils according to their perceived abilities, and some of the secondary schools used a system of ‘pupil progress tracking’ for all pupils, and hence there were more organisational approaches to planning. On the other hand, individual planning for pupils with SEN, in the form of IEPs, IBPs and individual learning plans, tended to be rather minimalist, i.e. a few key targets to be achieved by the pupil and strategies to be used by the teachers and other staff to work towards those targets.

This looked quite different in Portugal as ‘pupils with SEN’ had IEPs or CEIs and pupils with difficulties (non-SEN) had recovery plans but teachers had only one class plan based on the National Curriculum for all pupils. IEPs were very long documents with contextual information and recovery plans were based on short standard forms mainly with the aim of raising the pupils’ awareness of what they need to do to ‘overcome their difficulties’, but these planning documents had little impact on daily class planning and they were perceived by teachers as bureaucratic and ineffective documents.
When we focus on provision, as previously mentioned, the similarity is that all schools had different responses in place for some pupils, which involved the use of different spaces and structures, human resources, and activities. The spaces consisted mainly of rooms where individual or small groups of pupils were taken to do different work from that done in the mainstream classroom and to work with different people. The fact that in both countries there are support rooms where pupils with difficulties receive different provision can point to a common need felt in both countries, linked to how both educational systems are organised, based on principles of hierarchical progress with a curriculum to follow and levels to reach.

The structures, even though they took different forms in the two countries, involved mostly special education services, psychologists and other medical or rehabilitation professionals (Speech and Language Therapy, physiotherapy) and social services workers. In both countries special schools were seen as resource centres. This took different appearances due to the underlying values attributed to inclusion. Portugal ‘claims’ and aims to be a country with a one-track educational system in which all pupils go to mainstream schools. On the contrary, England takes a multi-track approach in which special and mainstream schools co-exist and sometimes are even co-located (share the same infrastructure). The Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) mentioned by some of the British teachers played a role to which there was not an equivalent in Portugal.
Chapter 7: Cross-country analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to pupil diversity - Planning</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>IEP; IBP; ILP</td>
<td>IEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision mapping</td>
<td>Pupil progress tracking</td>
<td>CEI (ind. spec. curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>('Accompaniment' plan – not used for selected pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Development Plan – not used by any teacher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to pupil diversity - Provision</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Organising by ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions (Assembly group, Reading recovery, Beat dyslexia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support (in &amp; out of class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tools (home-school diary, visual timetable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures (CAMHS, EMTAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support out of classroom:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sp. ed. teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mainstream teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SLT, other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different work in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities out of school (horse riding, swimming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 - Matrix of responses to pupil diversity: planning and provision in England and Portugal

The similarity in the human resources was that in both countries schools had additional human resources to support pupils with SEN. In England teaching assistants played an important role in the process of responding not only to pupils ‘with SEN’ but to all pupils who needed something different from or additional to what was provided to the majority. This was done along with the SENCO and the EAL coordinator (who in most cases was a high level teaching assistant), whereas in Portugal special education teachers had the leading role in providing additional interventions for pupils with SEN. Data indicated that the way these two professional groups behaved in school was different insofar as teaching assistants worked in and out of the mainstream classroom whereas special education teachers would only work with pupils out of the mainstream class and almost always in small groups due to bureaucratic (not pedagogical) reasons. Additionally, the variation in levels of training was one of the factors that diverged between these staff members, since teaching assistants could have very little training whereas special education teachers are qualified mainstream teachers with a specialisation in special education.
Finally, the activities offered to ‘different’ pupils in both countries were analogous as they involved providing something extra or different. However, English schools had a wider repertoire of ways to provide responses tailored to different working levels and needs. This repertoire included differentiation of work (which will be discussed in greater detail in the differences section of this chapter), but also meant supporting pupils in class and small group or individual interventions delivered out of the mainstream classroom. These interventions were usually structured, as they were mostly implemented school wide. As we saw in Chapter 5, in some cases they were commercial programmes bought in by the school. Most interventions focused on literacy but there were also numeracy or maths interventions, as well as interventions aimed at behaviour and social difficulties. In Portugal, pupils with SEN would also have in some cases different activities in class, but mainly different expectations from the teacher or different assessment criteria (e.g. answering only the first three questions of a 10-question activity sheet). Furthermore all the support from someone other than the mainstream teacher was always delivered out of the mainstream class. This support appeared to be more flexible and left to the responsibility of the special education teacher or support teacher, which could suggest more specialised and tailored responses. However, this does not appear to be the case as the interventions are delivered in groups and they were very similar within and between groups. In both countries some schools had responses such as family interventions at Eagle Primary school (Webster-Stratton parenting training programmers) and adapted sailing, swimming and therapeutic horse riding at Pelican school, which hinted the perception that some of the ‘difficulties’ shown by pupils needed more diversified ‘interventions’ in other settings and with other targets.
7.1.3 The influence of contextual factors and the impact of policy

The comparative analysis of data from schools in two countries allowed me to explore what factors had a bearing on differences in school practices. The characteristics of each educational system and its policies were certainly factors that played a major role on how teachers conceptualised and responded to ‘different’ pupils. Namely we can recognise three main aspects which show similarities cross-nationally: the impact of policy, the importance of available resources and the characteristics of individual staff members. If we start by looking at the way teachers described the pupils, we notice that they tended to use a repertoire of categories and labels which was clearly influenced by what was presented in educational policy documents from each of the countries. So, in England teachers made use of concepts present in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES 2001) used at the time fieldwork for this study was undertaken. Therefore, teachers would describe and ‘classify’ pupils by using the notions of SEN, school action, school action plus, statement of SEN, disabilities, English as an additional language. But they also used a repertoire linked to the notion of levels and attainment targets used in the National Curriculum: below average, ‘booster child’.

Similarly, in Portugal the policy terminology and concepts influenced how teachers understood and described their pupils. In this context the repertoire seemed dominated by legislation names i.e. ‘from the 3’ [do 3] referring to the pupils covered by the DL 3/2008 and ‘from the 50’ [do 50] referring to the DN 50/2005, along with concepts of SEN [pupil ‘of special education’ - aluno do especial], disability, pupil with individual curriculum [aluno de CEI], or pupil with difficulties in learning. The most prominent category, common to both countries was ‘special educational needs’ (SEN), but the definition of what was considered ‘special needs’, presented in national policy documents
was quite different and this was reflected in the teachers’ discourse. Given that this is considered a relevant difference, it will be discussed in the next section.

Eligibility criteria to receive additional or different provision were linked to the existing educational policy. So, who could ‘fit’ under the SEN or EAL label was on the whole determined by policy. However, who was in practice fitted under that label depended also on contextual factors such as resources available to schools and teachers. So for example, several teachers in England reported that the school would only put a pupil through for a statement assessment if they thought they could either learn something new about the pupil that would help them respond; or if they thought it would provide the school with additional resources (financial and/or human, e.g. an extra teaching assistant). Therefore, depending on the staff’s previous experience a pupil may not need to go through statutory assessment as the school may feel it already has the knowledge in place to respond to that pupil.

Likewise, depending on the context the same pupil may have been perceived differently. For example Malik was conceptualised as an above average/gifted and talented pupil at Eucalyptus primary school and as a polite and interested pupil who was well integrated in one of the top groups at Echinacea College. Another example were pupils who were perceived as very similar in primary school (Stuart and Sharon) who then went to be conceptualised and to follow quite different paths at Elderberry High School.

Similarly in Portugal, the relevance of context was clear in situations like the regular visits from a speech and language therapist influencing on the conceptualisation of a pupil at Physalis 1st cycle school – ‘she is struggling but she does not have speech and language difficulties’, or the Year 5 teacher
at Primula 2nd cycle school saying that ‘pupils who were considered exceptional nowadays were the average pupils of the past’.

Finally, in some cases individual teacher differences were visible through some of the teachers’ discourse. For example despite the considerable similarity within-country in the repertoires used by teachers to describe pupils, there were exceptions on an individual level, for example in the language used by the Physalis 1st Cycle School special education teacher ‘mental retarded’ [débil mental] and the SENCO at Eagle primary who referred to ‘additional needs’.

7.2 Differences

Having focused on the main similarities between countries, I will now address the critical differences. There are two main differences and these are the ‘unit’ that teachers use when planning and thinking about their teaching; and the labels and categories used.

7.2.1 Differentiation and levels vs. National Curriculum and class

Classes composed by diverse pupils create challenges to teachers as they may need to plan different activities or be prepared for some pupils not being able to follow what is being taught. This is linked to a variety of factors, namely the fact that in England pupils are expected to move up a grade based on their age regardless of the levels reached. Schools in England have been using the notion of differentiation as a response to the reality of ‘mixed ability classes’, at least since the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1988. In effect, there seem to be multiple levels of differentiation which could be associated with the expectation that teachers need to ‘know when and how to differentiate appropriately, using
approaches which enable pupils to be taught effectively’ (DfE 2011a). All teachers in England explained how their whole class planning was differentiated, and the data presented in Chapter 5 from both primary and secondary schools integrates five forms of differentiation:

- By task, which means planning different activities
- By targets, which involves pupils working towards different aims (e.g. focus on punctuation vs. mark names with capitals)
- By outcome, which entails the teacher having different expectations of the work produced by pupils
- By support, which is linked to helping certain pupils or groups (e.g. teaching assistant)
- By resources, which refers to tools that pupils may use (e.g. number line, computer)

To differentiate their planning teachers often used the notion of average as a structuring factor. Consequently, differentiation also involved pupils being organised into groups within the classroom, often based on their perceived ability. This way classes were perceived as having at least three subgroups (above average, average and below average). Another level of differentiation was connected to how pupils in almost all schools were reorganised into sets based on their perceived ability for some of the subjects (usually literacy/English and numeracy/ Maths). This meant that each class would split into smaller groups and different rooms.

In summary, for English teachers differentiation played a crucial role in responding to diversity, as they consistently worked with a differentiated curriculum targeted at different levels and various co-existing levels of differentiation. So, in this case the identification of pupils ‘with SEN’ was linked to the ‘need’ for different or extra responses on top of the already existing levels of differentiation.
By contrast, the Portuguese education system is based on a grade promotion structure in which by and large pupils must achieve minimum targets presented in the National Curriculum to progress. Teachers showed a very strong notion of ‘class’ [turma] as a meaningful unit. For 1st cycle teachers ‘their class’ by and large referred to the group of pupils that they would teach from Year 1 to Year 4. The class being kept the same during each cycle is considerable both a common and desirable practice. If pupils move from Year 4 to Year 5 within the same school cluster there is almost always an attempt to keep the class groups unaltered. Teachers interviewed explained how on a daily basis, pupils were generally expected to be doing the same kind of activities, based on the national curriculum. The exception was that pupils covered by the DL 3/2008 were entitled by law to have different work in class, different assessment and in some complex cases a different curriculum. Pupils who did not acquire the ‘minimum competencies’, as described in the National curriculum, could be ‘failed’ and retained in the same grade, in some cases more than once. In this instance, depending on the specific case, the pupil would either follow the same class group or be integrated with pupils who were 1 year younger. This view of ‘the class’ created a situation in which pupils who were considered ‘different’ and in need of different responses stood out a lot more in Portuguese schools. This was also reinforced by the categorisation system which will be discussed in the next section.

7.2.2 Labels and categories

The system of eligibility to access extra resources and support in both countries, is one of the key aspects that presents substantial differences in Portugal and England. I will now explore in what ways the organisation of the support system and the labels and categories used differ.
If we start by looking at English schools we soon realise that a variety of types of categories were in use. These can be conceptualised as three families of categories. Firstly, there was the notion of average (above/below) as an organising concept as I have proposed in the previous section. Secondly the use of the SEN related labels (SA, SA Plus, statement, disabilities, medical needs, behaviour needs). And finally, the use of the pupil’s language status through the concept of EAL.

‘Special educational needs’ is a much wider concept in England, which is not used in policy as synonym of disability as I suggest is the case in Portugal. The concept of SEN maintains most of its original ‘identity’ of having an interactive definition as conceptualised in the Warnock Report (Department for Education and Science 1978). Moreover, recent educational policy refers to SEND - special educational needs and/or disabilities and to a child ‘with SEN’ as one who either ‘has a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others of the same age, or has a disability which prevents or hinders him or her from making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age in mainstream schools’ (Department for Education & Department for Health 2014). Accordingly, SEN includes behavioural/social difficulties (e.g. difficulty making friends); reading and writing difficulties (e.g. dyslexia); difficulties understanding things; difficulties concentrating (e.g. Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder); physical needs or impairments’ (Gov.UK 2013) and there is no need for a medical diagnosis or health-related reasons to be considered ‘SEN’. For example teachers at Eucalyptus Primary schools described pupils as being ‘SEN in literacy’, in the sense that they had a difficulty in that one subject which was not synonym of disability.

In addition, the English systems presented a much more flexible and fluid approach to responding to the pupils’ needs in which pupils could move in
and out of ‘being SEN’ and of being perceived by teachers as needing something different. The previous SEN Code of practice (DfES 2001) referred to school action, school action plus categories which were used by teacher in all English schools in the sample to describe their ‘SEN pupils’. The concepts of School Action and School Action Plus would lead us to believe these categories focused on what the school needed to do to respond to each pupil. In other words, on the services provided. Therefore, that the focus was more at an organisational level than on an individual ‘deficit’ approach. However, the underlying assumption on the teachers’ discourse still seemed to be that there was something ‘wrong’, causing that pupil not to learn or to behave like the majority. As illustrated in Chapter 5 the prime underlying aim was to get all pupils to reach ‘the average’ mainly on literacy levels. The SEN Code of practice (DfES 2001) also made very clear that a pupil ‘must not be regarded as having a learning difficulty solely because the language or form of language of the home is different from the language in which he or she will be taught’. In other words, having English as an additional language should not be regarded as having SEN. EAL was however one of the key reasons to receive extra support, even if having EAL did maintain a distinct ‘identity’ to having SEN.

If we concentrate on what was observed in the Portuguese schools, we can identify a clear divide between SEN and other reasons for having difficulties. Contrarily to all other pupils, ‘SEN pupils’ may have adaptations to the curriculum, in some cases they have different subjects, they receive support out of the mainstream classroom, and some of them ‘will never reach the cycle competencies’ and so they should never ‘be failed’ and made repeat a year. Being covered by the DL 3/2008 is usually the outcome of a lengthy bureaucratic process and implies being considered to have ‘permanent’ health-related problems, so having SEN is a rigid and bureaucratic category.
This situation generates a very strong divide between ‘SEN’ and other pupils with difficulties, in a context where there seems to be a three-level system. The underlying assumptions are that the ‘normal’ pupils are those who are able to learn at the same pace; the SEN pupils are those who are not able to learn like their peers for health-related reasons; all the other pupils also have difficulties in learning but these cannot be explained by medical reasons. Pupils who have difficulties for ‘non-medical’ reasons, are the pupils in the ‘Other’ group. The reasons for their difficulties are conceptualised as being either extrinsic (difficult family life, poor quality of previous teaching, Portuguese as an additional language) or intrinsic ‘illegitimate’ reasons such as lack of motivation or attention.

Despite the existence of a number of pupils for whom Portuguese was an additional language, the concept of Portuguese as an additional language was not used by teachers, pupils were often conceptualised as ‘foreigners’ and there were no obvious responses to the difficulties presented, apart from different national exams for ‘Portuguese non mother tongue’ [Português Língua Não Materna].

7.3 Explaining similarities and differences

If we look at the account of similarities and differences just presented, it is possible to describe the mechanisms common to schools in both countries in the following way. The teachers teach all the pupils in a class. This class may be perceived as a whole as was the case of the Portuguese teachers, or as various ‘ability’ sub-groups as was the most common case for teachers in England. The outcome of this more or less differentiated practice is that most pupils will ‘learn’ and reach the expected targets. However, some pupils do not seem to learn ‘like the majority’. These are the pupils who will be perceived as different. Hence, the pupils who are considered different are
those who struggle or are ‘not able’ to learn like the majority. So, in both countries being different was associated with being below the average and having difficulties. The difficulties are often framed as problems presented by students and the teachers construct the notion of difference by labelling these pupils and trying to find explanations for their ‘problems’. In other words, in both countries when describing the pupils who were identified as different and ‘needed something different’, teachers applied certain categories and labels, but they also tried to explain the reasons behind those difficulties. The model presented in Figure 8 illustrates this analysis in a diagrammatic form.

In conclusion, if we compare schools in the two countries, English schools appear to be better prepared to deal with a diverse pupil population. Nonetheless, I would suggest that the underlying assumption still is that all pupils should reach the same. In the case of England this is conceptualised as ‘the average’ and in the case of Portugal as ‘a homogeneous group’. Based on the analysis of the similarities and differences presented in this chapter, the next chapter will discuss the mechanisms of conceptualisation and management of difference as represented in Figure 8. This is done with reference to a notion of ‘problem-solving’ and a notion of repertoire approach to pupil diversity.
Chapter 7: Cross-country analysis

Figure 8 - The mechanisms of construction of ‘difference’ in mainstream schools: how the processes of conceptualisation and management of educational difference interact
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Chapter 8: Discussion

This research started from a recognition of the importance of understanding existing practices around individual planning in England and Portugal. In the previous chapter I presented the findings of the study. These explored approaches to individual planning and to responding to pupil diversity in schools in both countries. This followed from what emerged from the review of the literature and existing issues and gaps. ‘IEPs’ are only one of many forms of individual plan, however, the notion of ‘IEP’ is used in the literature to symbolise individual planning in general. Thus the acronym is used to mean different things in different contexts. For this reason in this thesis I use the generic concept of ‘individual planning’.

The chapter is organised into four sections. The first section provides my answers to the research questions that informed this thesis:

- Who is identified as needing individualised planning?
- What forms of individual planning are used in different contexts?
- What provision and interventions do these plans propose?
- What assumptions about difference do these responses to diversity imply?

The fourth research question is an overarching question which adds a level of analysis to this comparative study. The accounts from the schools in England and Portugal and the similarities and differences between the two contexts are discussed in relation to this question. This discussion is presented under four themes. These are the themes that emerged from looking at the evidence from the pupil and school cases (presented in
Chapters 5, 6) across the two countries. The themes represent commonalities in the process of conceptualising and responding to pupil diversity.

In the second section, I summarise my contribution to knowledge. In the third section I briefly comment on implications of this study for policy and practice. In the fourth section, to conclude, I evaluate the strengths and limitations of my study, while making suggestions for further research.

8.1 Answering the research questions

8.1.1 Who is identified as needing individualised planning?

I found that in both countries pupils ‘with difficulties’, pupils who did not reach the targets expected by their teachers and those who were ‘below’ average were identified as needing individualised planning. Additionally, the perceived need for individual planning included pupils classified as having Special Educational Needs and pupils with disabilities. It is important to mention that ‘SEN’ and ‘having a disability’ meant different things in England and Portugal. In the educational policy of both countries, pupils ‘above average’ and those considered gifted and talented should also have individual planning. However, in the schools that took part in the study, pupils perceived to be on the ‘top’ end of the ‘achievement’ continuum tended to not have formal individual plans. In the case of English schools, the pupils whose first language was different from the one used at school, and that had a negative impact on their ‘achievement’, would also be identified as needing some individualised provision. The table presented in Appendix 26 shows how the pupils perceived to need individualised planning were conceptualised by practitioners in England and in Portugal.
8.1.2 **What forms of individual planning are used in different contexts?**

There were various forms of individual planning being used in the schools that took part in this study, however, each school followed one type of planning (or more than one in parallel) consistently across the school. In Portugal there were individual education plans, ‘recovery plans’, ‘follow up plans’, development plans and individual educational curricula (CEI). In England there were individual education plans, individual behaviour plans, individual learning plans, provision maps, SEN register, and differentiated whole class plans.

By looking across all forms of individualised planning used, it is noticeable that they have different types of information and serve different purposes. Additionally, we can notice that there is a predominance of plans that are SEN related. To be exact, there are plans with medical or health related information, such as Individual education plans in Appendices 19 and 22. Besides, there are plans designed by and for teachers and teaching assistants to focus their attention and target specific goals (for example the individual education plans in Appendices 7 – 10, and individual behaviour plan in Appendix 11). As opposed to this, there are formulaic plans which seem to serve a bureaucratic purpose and, in some cases, make pupil aware and accountable of their strengths, weaknesses and responsibilities (examples of this are the recovery plans in Appendices 23 and 24, and the recovery/ follow up/ development Plan in Appendix 25). Another type of planning that some schools use are plans for management of (available) resources, by tracking teachers’ concerns and assigning individual pupils to interventions (for example the provision map in Appendix 13 and the special educational needs and disabilities register in Appendix 14). Finally, there are whole class teaching and learning plans which are differentiated, in most cases by ‘level
groups’ but also by planning specifically (activities, support, resources) for individual pupils (see for example the short term plan in Appendix 12).

8.1.3 What provision and interventions do these plans propose?

Provision for pupils identified as needing individual planning can be adapted in numerous ways, however, only some of those adaptations are visible in formal planning documents. For example teachers often adapt the level of support or guidance they provide to individual pupils through a process of improvisation (Ainscow 1999), and this is not shown on formal plans. However, there are a number of interventions which are listed in the formal plans described in the previous section. These interventions involve the use of different or additional resources both human and physical. Human resources include support provided in or out of the mainstream classroom, with a teaching assistant (in the case of English schools), a teacher, a special education teacher (in the case of Portuguese schools) or other health-related practitioners (e.g. SLT). Support outside the classroom ranges from more structured interventions (in England) to more ‘open’ support (in Portugal) but focuses mainly on literacy and numeracy, and some social/emotional interventions. Physical resources involved in individualised provision comprise tools used in the mainstream classroom (e.g. use of laptop, enlarged font hand-outs) or out of class resources (e.g. rooms for individual support, quiet place to be used by pupils when needed, home-school diary).

Individual plans often also describe levels of support, extra time, special assessment conditions and other specific strategies to be used in-class for example use positive feedback, preferable sitting organisation, work in pairs/group/ individually.
8.1.4 What assumptions about difference and diversity do these processes and responses imply?

The primary assumption about diversity and difference implied in the phenomenon of individual planning as described in this thesis is the dichotomous division of pupils into ‘most/ some’ groups. And implicit to this is an assumption of diversity as a challenge and in some cases a problem. Students considered to be different and in need of different planning are those ‘with problems’ and teachers respond by trying to problem-solve (Theme 1). Despite the rhetoric around individual planning, schools’ responses are to some extent restricted by a limited repertoire available in each context (Theme 2), this involves a narrow view of diversity in which pupils are fitted into pre-existing ‘profiles’. Both in terms of responses and conceptualisation of pupil diversity and school responses, the impact of contextual aspects is clear (Theme 3), however this is often not perceived by practitioners working directly with the pupils. I will end this section by discussing how these assumptions about diversity impact on schools’ responses to pupil diversity (Theme 4).

Theme One: A problem-solving approach to pupil diversity

In this section, I argue that teachers generally function through a problem-solving approach to pupil diversity. Figure 9 represents a model of problem-solving. This model was designed based on the evidence presented in Chapters 5 and 6, and also based on the problem-solving model for intervention in ‘habilitation’ services proposed by Björck-Åkesson and Granlund (2002). The perspective presented by these authors is different from that portrayed in the field of inclusive education reviewed in Chapter 2 (Ainscow 2001; Skrtic 1991a). The first refers to a way of good service delivery in ‘habilitation’ services and early intervention, whereas the second
relates to a way to create more responsive and equitable education systems. Björck-Åkesson and Granlund suggest that a problem-solving approach to intervention is based on four pillars: identifying a problem to be addressed, providing explanations for that problem, determining goals of the intervention, and deciding what methods to use. I argue that the problem-solving approach to pupil diversity found in this study involves three main elements:

- the identification of a problem,
- an attempt to explain the reasons for that problem, and
- an effort to find appropriate responses to that problem

I propose that the two first blocks (See Figure 9) can be grouped under the overarching title of ‘conceptualising difference’, whereas the responses (both in terms of planning and provision) refer to the management of difference in schools. Also, as illustrated in the diagram (Figure 9) the three elements are deeply connected and have impact on one another.

The data collected indicates that teachers in both countries identify the pupils who have difficulties in learning as being ‘different’ and needing individual planning and additional or different provision.

In Portugal national policy establishes strict eligibility criteria and a compartmentalised support system in which the medical approach has a powerful influence. The type of planning and support depends on the explanation offered for the difficulties experienced by the pupils. On the contrary, in England access to additional support using the school resources is more flexible. It is also independent of the reasons for the pupils’ perceived difficulties. Nonetheless, there is a divide between difficulties caused by what is usually referred to as SEND and difficulties linked to the
pupils who have EAL. The SEND category includes all pupils who have ‘significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others the same age’ (Department for Education & Department for Health 2014). It includes difficulties ‘caused’ by behavioural difficulties and those of social origin.

The process of identifying problems and possible explanations is a commonality across schools and countries. It can be described as a process of ‘differential diagnosis’ that starts when a pupil is perceived to have difficulties in learning, so the ‘problem’ in this case is the existence of difficulties that call for individual planning and provision. The teachers will then try to understand and explain why that pupil is not able to learn in the same way and at the same pace as the peers.

Figure 9 - Problem-solving approach to pupil diversity: conceptualisation and management of difference

For example, looking at Anita’s case vignette (p. 126), ‘her’ problem was that she ‘had difficulties’ and was not progressing ‘as expected’. In Year 2 the
teacher conceptualised her ‘differences’ by saying she was ‘school action plus’, she ‘had medical needs’, a visual impairment and EAL. The explanation offered for ‘her’ difficulties was that she was born at 21 weeks. In Year 3 teacher Anita’s ‘problem’ was that she had ‘poor concentration’, difficulty in retaining information, and she was very insecure, dependent, upset and emotional. Anita was still conceptualised as a pupil with ‘medical/sensory/physical needs’. However, the teacher explained that her problems were related to her ‘troubled home life.’

Taking into account the explanations found and the resources available at school the process involves offering some form of individual planning and provision. In this problem-solving approach, if the responses provided do not solve the ‘problem’, one of the assumptions is that the problem explanation was wrong. Therefore another cycle starts, other explanations are offered and the pupils are assigned to other interventions. For example, when a pupil has difficulties and the language used at school is not his or her first language (English or Portuguese as an additional language) then often it is hypothesised that the language is the cause for the difficulties displayed. If this pupil takes longer than the others with EAL/PAL to learn, then it is often hypothesised that the reason is not a language difficulty but special educational needs. The case of Nadia illustrated this process. Nadia’s difficulties were initially explained by the fact that she had EAL. However, since she was not progressing at the same rate as other ‘EAL pupils’, teachers hypothesised that she ‘had SEN’. The explanations offered for Nadia’s difficulties are based on the teachers’ contextual experience. In some cases, ‘small problems’, which are not perceived by the teachers as the ‘main issue’ may be addressed because the school holds strong resources for that type of response (See for example the case vignette of Raquel, p. 179).
The problem-solving approach used by teachers rests on the existence of ‘regular’ practices that work for most pupils. However, these do not work for all pupils. When a pupil does not learn the same way, at the same pace as others, he or she is conceptualised as having difficulties. Teachers try to find explanations for these difficulties and propose individualised responses. Commonly, the goal of these responses is ‘catching’ up the peers or at least being the closest possible to the expectations (age and context appropriate). If the responses do not solve the ‘problem’, the cycle restarts and teachers create another hypothesis about what could be causing the difficulties observed. This mechanism is linked how the processes of conceptualisation and management of educational difference interact as I have illustrated in Figure 8 (‘The mechanisms of construction of ‘difference’ in mainstream schools: how the processes of conceptualisation and management of educational difference interact, p. 239).

The problem-solving approaches described by Ainscow, Skrtic and others (Ainscow 1991a; Skrtic 1991a; Lloyd 2010; Eisenman et al. 2010) presuppose uncertainty, inventiveness, innovation and that the ‘problem’ to solve is how to improve ‘the quality of teaching and learning provided for all pupils’ (Ainscow 1991a, p.304). This is illustrated in the following quotes:

the primary problem to be solved was implementation of effective instruction for all students, with problem-solving on behalf of individual students playing a supportive role (Eisenman et al. 2010, p.101)

Education where organization and practice are rooted in problem-solving which promotes critical reflection through collaboration, interdependence and diversity, and which recognizes uncertainty as a prerequisite for innovation, can indeed be seen as a model for inclusive equitable and excellent education which provides access and genuine participation for all (Lloyd 2010, p.144)
The approach to problem-solving described by these authors, however, is different from the type of problem-solving shown in the data collected for this study. For example in the Portugal, when teachers identified pupils for a special education assessment, they hoped that those pupils would be categorised as having SEN. However, when commenting on the school’s responses to ‘SEN’ many exclaimed that it did not make any difference and in some cases even disturbed their classes. They wanted the pupils to be identified so they had an explanation for the difficulties, they wanted to understand ‘what the pupil’s problem is’. So, the process had little to do with finding the best way(s) to respond to pupil diversity.

Data presented in Chapters 5 and 6 indicates that individual planning does not imply a ‘personalised invented response to educational problems’ (Skrtic 1991a). Individual planning is a step in a process of responding to difficulties, which involves some pupils being perceived as needing something different and/or additional. Therefore, the process of responding to difference through individual planning implies ‘a series of technical tasks concerned with finding solutions to the problems of children’ (Ainscow 1998, p.12; Ainscow 1991b, p.302).

This perception rests on problematic assumptions about difference which I have discussed in Chapter 2 (p. 41). Even though the notion of SEN is openly comparative in England, the process of individual planning operates under the assumptions one and five proposed by Minow (1990, p.70). That is, that difference is intrinsic and that the ‘status quo is natural, uncoerced and good’. In other words, it means that pupils have difficulties due to intrinsic factors and that some pupils having difficulties is ‘the natural trend’ in schooling. This is associated with notions of fixed ability and bell-curve distribution thinking which have been identified as a barrier to a more equitable response to pupil diversity (Hart et al. 2004; Florian & Spratt 2013).
Besides, the problem-approach to pupil diversity discussed fails to recognise the impact of context and social constructions (Burr 2003; Ore 2003; Saraga 1998).

For this reason, I would argue that a problem-solving approach would only be a way to provide better responses to pupil diversity if operated on an assumption that ‘difference’ and difficulties are a result of the interaction between the characteristics of individual pupils (See Bartolo et al. 2007, outlined on Table 3) and contextual factors. On the contrary, the problem-solving approach implies that it is possible to, by trial and error, find a definite solution for the ‘pupils’ difficulties’. It fails to recognise that the challenges created by a diverse and heterogeneous pupil population are strongly associated with the type of schooling systems in place. The evidence indicates that mostly ‘problems’ were defined and explained through within child/ family factors. The problem solving approach identified in this study is not the highly flexible and responsive approach that Ainscow and Skrtic (Ainscow 1991a; Skrtic 1991a) have in mind. It is a much more formulaic approach in which problems have to be categorised in specified ways so that predetermined responses can be made.

**Theme Two: A repertoire approach to pupil diversity**

In this section I contend that in most cases teachers and schools draw upon a limited repertoire of conceptualisations of and responses to pupil diversity. This repertoire depends on contextual factors such as existing policies, resources and the teachers’ previous experiences. The notion of repertoire has been used in the literature in the field of educational responses to pupil diversity to describe:
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- the ‘repertoire’ of approaches to teaching and learning, lesson formats or skills used by teachers (Ainscow 2011; Faubert 2012; DfES 2004; Hart 1992; Eisenman et al. 2010)

- the ‘repertoire’ of schools’ resources to deal with certain groups of pupils (Dyson et al. 2002)

Schön (1983) extensively used the notion of repertoires when explaining that professionals encounter certain types of situations again and again, and they learn what to look for and how to respond to what they find - they develop a repertoire of expectations, images, examples, understandings and techniques (1983, pp.60, 138). In his seminal text, ‘The Reflective Practitioner’ (1983), Schön calls this repertoire ‘knowing-in-practice’. ‘Knowing-in-practice’ becomes implicit and automatic, which can lead to a narrowness of vision and to being ‘selectively inattentive to phenomena that do not fit the categories’ of the repertoire (1983, p.61).

An artful teacher sees a child’s difficulty in learning to read not as a defect in the child but as a defect ‘on his own instruction’. So he must find a way of explaining what is bothering the pupil. He must do a piece of experimental research, then and there, in the classroom. And because the child’s difficulties may be unique, the teacher cannot assume that his repertoire of explanations will suffice, even though they are ‘at tongue’s end’. He must be ready to invent new methods and must ‘endeavour to develop in himself the ability of discovering them’. (Schön 1983, p.66)

This quote reflects various aspects relevant to this study. To begin with it refers to the explanation of the difficulties either as a pupil or a teacher shortcoming as I discussed in the previous section. In addition, it evokes the problem-solving approach described in the previous section: teachers would identify a problem, try to explain the reasons for that problem and provide responses to it. Nevertheless, it reiterates the need to be prepared to invent new methods and to look at each pupil on a case-by-case basis.
The evidence gathered during this study suggests that teachers develop repertoires of conceptualisations, explanations and responses to pupil diversity. This implicit and automatic ‘knowing-in-practice’ (1983, p.61) is influenced by the education system in which the teachers operate. The ways pupils were conceptualised and responded to, were restricted by the repertoires available to teachers.

The repertoires available to conceptualise difference relate to the collection of concepts that were used by teachers to identify and explain ‘pupil difficulties’. For example in England teachers constructed the notion of pupil diversity by referring to ‘being below average’, ‘school action plus’, having SEN, disabilities, medical needs, poor attendance, family issues, ‘gaps in knowledge’ and language issues, namely ‘EAL’. So these were the explanations for the pupils, being ‘on school action or school action plus’, ‘being EAL’. So, these ‘labels’ were used as rationale for the need for individual planning and provision. Additionally, as it has been discussed in the previous section, teachers in England also identified pupils who had individual planning because they were ‘above average’ or ‘gifted and talented’ but for these pupils teachers did not go through a ‘problem-solving’ approach, or felt the need to explain the reason(s) why those pupils were ‘above average’. In Portugal the conceptualisation repertoire included ‘being SEN’, ‘being from the 3’ [pupils covered by the decree-law 3/2008 - Special education], ‘physical limitation’, ‘disability’, ‘impairment’, ‘being CEI’ [pupils who had an individual curriculum] or ‘being from the 50’ [pupils covered by the law 50/2005], ‘family’, ‘lack of commitment/ work/ motivation’ and ‘poor previous teaching’.

So, when explaining why they had selected particular pupils for the study, the teachers used a mixture of the students’ life and school histories and descriptions of the students’ ‘problems’, difficulties and needs. This was
similar to the medical approach to disability discussed in Chapter 2. It is also in line with the idea that that ‘certain children are perceived as having things wrong with them that make it difficult for them to participate in the normal curriculum’ (Ainscow 1991a). Mostly teachers interviewed during this study had a conservative view of educational difficulties, based on deficit views.

The repertoire available to respond to difference refers to a limited collection of ways of responding to difficulties (See Table 14, p. 228). ‘Pupils with difficulties’ have individual education plans or other types of individual planning, such as Individual behaviour plans, and Recovery plans. In chapter 2, I presented alternative responses to pupil diversity like group plans and teaching and learning plans (Frankl 2005; Booth 2003) and the evidence suggests versions of these are part of the repertoire used at Eagle and Eucalyptus Primary, respectively (See Appendix 13 and Appendix 12). Apart from individual planning, the responses involve a repertoire of additional support or interventions. Table 14 summarises the repertoires of interventions available in England and Portugal. The notion of repertoires presupposed that typically pupils are assigned to pre-existing interventions. The majority of these are performed in ‘little rooms’ outside the mainstream classroom. Nevertheless, in England there is a considerable amount of additional adult support provided within the mainstream classroom. In both countries there is a predominance of literacy interventions. Furthermore, schools in both countries have literacy interventions to which ‘pupils who are struggling’ can be allocated; these are sometimes called booster sessions. There were also some interventions focused on numeracy difficulties. And only in the case of English schools there are social and communication interventions.

Despite the generalised use of differentiation in English schools, and the whole class plans targeted at pupils working at various levels, only those at
the ‘bottom end of the continuum of ability’ are regarded as needing individualised planning. This individualised planning does not necessarily entail individualised responses in terms of provision, as the data indicated that it consisted mostly of assigning pupils into pre-existing responses. Responses which were mainly targeted at groups of pupils rather than individuals and often consisted of interventions that were not necessarily qualitatively different from what was delivered in the mainstream lessons. In reality, they consisted in most cases of intensified versions, through a higher ratio of adult per pupil and a repetition of what has been done before or what would be done later on.

The repertoires for conceptualising and responding are used within the problem-solving process as ‘algorithms’ (Becker 1986). An algorithm in the sense that if a pupil is perceived to have a certain ‘problem’ then he/she will be assigned to a certain intervention. So, for example despite Sarah being described by her teacher as ‘white British’, her language difficulties meant that within the repertoire of responses available she would attend sessions for children with EAL. So, most responses are designed with specific ‘problems’ in mind, rather than specific pupils. This is consistent with what has been theorised by Skrtic (1991a, p.29) that ‘A client cannot just have any need, he or she must have a need that the organisation and its professionals have been standardised to meet’. In spite of the evidence not suggesting a more fluid and responsive systematic approach, such an approach might well be present in teachers’ classroom practices. However, this study has focused on the more formalised process of individual planning.

The existence of those pre-established repertoires problematizes the rhetoric around individual planning, reviewed in Chapter 2. The idea that there may be an algorithm, a step-by-step procedure to ‘solve a problem’ is problematic in a number of ways. Firstly it fails to take into account the uniqueness of
individual pupils’ cases. Secondly, it raises questions about the more positive aspects of individual planning presented in the Literature Review. To be specific, that the individual planning process is an opportunity to involve parents and pupils in establishing meaningful goals and educational priorities. Now, if conceptualisations and responses to pupil diversity are based on a limited pre-established repertoire, the input of pupils and parents is restricted. And finally, it implies that the starting point is the existing resources and procedures in place which is not what is portrayed in the discourses around individual planning. This is consistent with some of the concerns about the use of IEPs which I examined in Chapter 2 (Tod 1999).

The evidence clearly shows that the repertoires available to teachers to conceptualise and respond to pupil diversity are shaped by contextual factors. These include the national educational policy, the school context, the resources available and individual teachers’ experience and knowledge. These factors are displayed in Figure 8 (p. 239) as part of the mechanisms of construction of educational ‘difference’. I will elaborate on the impact of contextual factors in the next section.

**Theme Three: The influence of context in conceptualising and responding to pupil diversity**

By building on the previous two sections and on the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, in this section I argue that ‘who is identified as needing individualised responses’ depends greatly on contextual factors. This is problematic for two main reasons, the common assumptions about difference (Minow 1990), and the fact that it raises concerns about equity (Artiles et al. 2011; Dyson & Gallannaugh 2008).

The importance of taking into account the context and contextual factors is well established in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 (cf. WHO 2001;
Minow 1990; Ore 2003; Burr 2003). It is important that schools understand contextual factors when they try to tackle inequities and attempt to develop more equitable responses to their pupils:

a child defined as having special educational needs in one school or districts might not be categorised as such in another (Ainscow et al. 2013, p.3)

This study corroborates that contextual factors have an influence on which pupils are identified as needing individual planning. The impact of contextual factors is illustrated in Figure 8 (p. 239). The figure, designed based on data from the study, shows the impact of the characteristics of individual teachers and of educational systems. By characteristics of educational systems I am referring to existing policies and resources (financial, human and physical) and underlying fundamental thinking about the role of education and schooling. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 3, the cultural and historical context of each country influences thinking and procedures around individual planning. The present neo-liberal policies and commodification of schooling do not sit well with attempts to create more inclusive contexts and practices. The assessment of and comparison between schools (and even between countries) through a narrow definition of academic attainment pose a challenge to inclusion. This narrow definition of what it means to succeed in school underpins a limited view of the curriculum, with a preoccupation with literacy and numeracy. Additionally, it fosters more individualised responses to diversity, in which each pupil must work towards and achieve individual literacy and numeracy targets. This compartmentalised way of seeing the curriculum and the school population does not support views of diversity as an asset.
I will now provide examples of the impact of policy, resources and individual teacher characteristics on how pupils in this study were conceptualised by school practitioners.

Educational policies usually establish eligibility criteria for access to resources. Thus policies have a direct impact on ‘who’ teachers identify as needing individual responses. In terms of national policies, the categories associated with eligibility criteria to access support and resources have an impact on conceptualisations of and responses to ‘difference’. For example teachers in England use concepts to conceptualise difference such as ‘School Action’ as presented in the SEN Code of Practice (DfES 2001) or notions of ‘level’ and ‘average’ which can be linked to national curriculum levels (DfE 2014). In Portugal teachers use the names of the two main laws (DN50/2005 and DL 3/2008) to conceptualise pupils. This is consistent with the view of policy as a resource to provide teachers with conceptual tools and guidance frameworks presented by Ainscow et al. (2007, p.17). In fact, it was found that the repertoire of responses has an impact on how the pupils are conceptualised, and ultimately define who is constructed as different.

Policy is also linked to the provision of material resources (Ainscow et al. 2007). In this study three types of resources were identified. These were financial, physical and human resources; financial resources have an influence on the physical and human resources available but they are not the only factor to have an impact. Resources have a big impact on the repertoires available to teachers to respond to pupil diversity. For example, in England teaching assistants are key human resources in responding to pupils with individual planning. In Portugal this role is played by teachers or special education teachers. The difference in status and role of these two practitioners has an impact for example on how they work. TAs work alongside teachers supporting pupils in mainstream classrooms and they
deliver interventions outside of the classroom as well as. Support teachers and Special education teachers tend to withdrawing small groups from the mainstream classrooms. The differences are also present in the pupil/practitioner ratios. As mentioned in Chapter 7, the characteristics of the physical space have an impact on the repertoires to respond to pupil diversity. For example, extra rooms are needed to provide interventions in withdrawal from the mainstream classroom).

But there are other contextual factors that impact conceptualisations of and responses to pupil diversity. The impact of individual teacher characteristics in the way pupils were conceptualised and responded to, was also noticeable. I will provide three examples from my data. The first is the way individual planning was managed at Eagle Primary school was linked to the SENCO’s personal search for a better way to respond to pupil diversity. The way ‘provision maps’ were used was unusual; it was based on an attempt to optimise available regardless of the pupils ‘SEN status’. The second example is how the personal experience of having EAL of the head of Year 7 at Elderberry High School, which seemed to have an impact on how Marlee (a pupil with EAL) was conceptualised. The third example is the opinion of the head of the Year 5 class interviewed at Primula 2nd/3rd cycle school. This teacher was against the new policies to decrease grade retention and considered that the general pupil ability had decreased when compared to the past. The impact of the teachers’ opinion has been discussed in Chapter 2. The teachers’ expectations have been proved to impact on pupil performance (See for example Jussim & Harber 2005; Hayes & Deyhle 2000; Mitchell et al. 2010). Moreover, teachers bring their own values to teaching and using notions of ability (Hart et al. 2004), and ‘difference’:

Those preparing to become teachers bring their own attitudes and beliefs about people who are perceived to be different into the
profession, and those influence how they respond to student differences’ (Moltó et al. 2010, p.245)

The evidence presented in Chapters 5 and 6, outlines how some of the pupils followed from primary to secondary school were described quite differently in each of the contexts. What is more, they were also receiving different types of support from what they had received the previous year in their primary schools (e.g. Stuart and Sharon, Maria and Catarina). These changes, in the way pupils where conceptualised and responded to, did not seem to be associated with changes in the pupils alone but had to do with a mixture of the school and the teachers’ characteristics. Furthermore, the group or class in which the pupils were working has an impact on conceptualisations of difference. So in the case of Malik, in primary school he was perceived as ‘above average’ and ‘gifted and talented’. In secondary school, he was ‘average’ in one of the ‘higher sets’. In other words, if the ‘average’ is low, the pupil is conceptualised as ‘above average’. On the contrary, if the ‘average’ is similar to the pupil’s ‘level’ then he or she is not perceived as different. The case of Marlee provides another example of the impact of pupil grouping. She did not want to be moved to a ‘lower’ set because that meant ‘she was daft’. The negative effect of this type of separation of children according to their perceived ability has been reviewed in the literature with regards to differentiation practices (Hart 1996, p.10; Cortesao 1998).

In summary, while these pupils may have characteristics that impact on the teachers’ lesson planning, it is reasonable to claim that the conceptualisations and responses to pupil diversity reveal as much if not more about the context as they do about individual pupils and their characteristics. As discussed in Chapter 2, the impact of context is problematic for two reasons: the fact that it does not take into account the common held assumptions about difference
The boundaries between ‘categories’ were portrayed by several teachers as definite. Even if this posed a challenge for some teachers, the boundaries between average-, SEN- and language status-related categories were presented as if they were mutually exclusive. The attempt to ‘sort’ pupils into categories is attributable to the management of access to individual responses. While this practice may be necessary to allocate funding and extra resources to schools, it impacts on how the pupils are conceptualised. These categories are not the helpful in the process of planning and providing better educational responses to pupils. They break complicated perceptions into ‘discrete traits’ (Minow 1990). These traits, crystallised into labels or categories, may have negative and discriminatory effects in education (See Ho 2004). For instance, research has critiqued a disproportionality in identification of certain pupils groups as having SEN (Artiles 1998; Artiles & Bal 2008; Dyson & Gallannaugh 2008; Artiles 2003; Artiles 2011; Dunne et al. 2011; Muijs & Dunne 2010).

Moreover, categories are assumed to be ‘natural’ and intrinsic as opposed to being socially constructed within specific environments (Clarke & Cochrane 1998; Minow 1990; Ore 2003). For example judgements about the pupils’ ability are not viewed as ‘culturally and historically specific’ (Hart et al. 2004, p.5). These ‘judgements of ability’ may deeply affect the pupils’ sense of identity ‘not just while they are at school, but beyond, into adulthood.’ (Hart et al. 2004, p.4). As suggested by the title of this thesis, I propose that teachers and schools respond to pupil diversity, and in this process they ‘construct difference’. They identify some pupils as needing individual planning, they label only certain pupils as having difficulties, ‘being SEN’, ‘being school action’, or ‘being 3’. These processes, linked to making extra
resources available and designing different responses for some pupils, actually has an impact on how the pupils are conceptualised. This is even more problematic in systems divided into ‘impermeable and hierarchical tracks’ which have been suggested to accentuate educational inequalities (Felouzis & Charmillot 2013, p.183). In the next section I will focus on the impact conceptualisations of diversity and difference have an on how schools respond to pupil diversity.

**Theme Four: Conceptualising diversity and difference and its impact on responses to pupil diversity**

Having discussed the influence of context in the processes of conceptualising difference, in this section I will discuss how the underlying assumptions about difference have an impact on the schools’ responses to pupil diversity.

In this study I used a particular meaning of ‘being different’, this was an outcome of the attempt to understand which pupils were perceived by their teachers as needing something different from or additional to what was provided to their peers. The outcome could have been different in two different directions. On one hand, teachers could conceptualise each pupil as an unique individual, with unique planning needs; on the other extreme teachers could say that when they plan they do it for the class without making distinctions between individual pupils (Lewis & Norwich 2005; Dyson 2001a). This kind of dilemmatic scenario is an example of the conflicting ‘intention to treat all learners as essentially the same and an equal and opposite intention to treat them as different’ (Dyson 2001b, p.25).

These dilemmas are posed by the existence of a diverse pupil population in a hierarchical educational system. This system was originally built for teaching masses of pupils who would ‘move up’ provided that they acquired certain knowledge and skills (Roldão 2003). Therefore, it underpins a dichotomous
view of pupils who are theoretically organised into two groups: ‘most’ and ‘some’. ‘Most’ pupils learn, but ‘some’ pupils have difficulties (as shown on Figure 8). The pupils who ‘have difficulties’ to learn are considered ‘different’. For the purposes of teaching and planning lessons, teachers were not concerned about identity differences, as long as they did not impact on cognitive characteristics. In other worlds, teachers mentioned gender, ethnicity, age, and impairments, only if they thought it had an impact on how the pupils learned and performed. Otherwise, these aspects of diversity were not considered relevant for lesson planning purposes in the context of thinking about individual planning. In the context of individual planning, I argue that the way difference is conceptualised and managed rests on the core underlying assumption that ‘difference’ means cognitive diversity and difficulties. In this context difference is a synonym of difficulty, and therefore a challenge, and a ‘problem to be solved’.

This contrasts with views on diversity portrayed in the literature in the sense that diversity is often portrayed as a value (Humphrey et al. 2006; Thomas & Loxley 2007). For example pupil diversity being described as ‘an asset, an enduring source of uncertainty and thus the driving force behind innovation, growth of knowledge, and progress’ (Skrtic 1991a, p.36). These are what Sliwka (2010) refers to as ‘schools of diversity’, however, the evidence from this study suggests that schools are based on a paradigm of heterogeneity in which difference is a challenge. Individual planning is a way to ‘deal with the challenge’ of pupil diversity without changing the way schools perceive difference and without radical changes to educational systems.

Researchers preoccupied with the advancement of participation for all pupils in education suggest several changes and ways to make schools better at responding to pupils diversity, these include Skrtic’s suggestion that schools must become adhocratic, problem-solving organisations (Skrtic 1991a);
Ainscow’s emphasis on the role of school staff and calls for an analysis of existing practices and experimentation within a context of cooperation and inclusive culture (Ainscow 2011; e.g. Ainscow 1991b), Florian’s proposition of creating learning opportunities for all by focusing on learning for all, rather than on differences between pupils and on deterministic beliefs about ability (Florian & Black-Hawkins 2011). The commonality in the changes proposed is that they all call for a ‘reconceptualization of what we mean by educational difficulty’ (Ainscow 1991a). They require a view of difference as an ‘organisational artefact, a matter of not fitting the conventional practices in an organisation that is not configured to accommodate diversity and so must screen it out’ (Skrtic 1991a, p.30). Moreover, they imply a move away from conceptualising pupils as ‘most’ and ‘some’ and from perceiving difference as intrinsic.

However, educational systems ‘resist change’ and, reforms are based on a ‘naïve pragmatism’. This approach, based on an ‘unreflective acceptance of the assumptions behind social practices’ (Skrtic 1991b, p.149), replicates the power structures and status quo of the wider society. Therefore, changes are essential for difference to be perceived as an asset: changes in generalised ‘beliefs about the purpose of schooling’ (Ainscow 1991a, p.9); changes in the way schools function as organisations; changes in the way teachers operate within schools:

In sum, rather than being on the defensive about diversity, we should go on the offensive. We should look at difference as something that can improve performance, not as something that we have to be concerned about so that we don’t get sued. We should encourage people to think differently. (Page 2007, p.xxix)
8.2 Contribution to knowledge

For over two decades researchers have attempted to find ways of developing more effective and equitable educational systems. The challenges posed to schools by pupil diversity have mainly been tackled by the scholarly community in the fields of Special Needs Education, Inclusive Education. Notwithstanding this considerable body of knowledge my work presents a novel approach to school’s responses to pupil diversity. The methods used and the empirical findings reported here make significant contributions to the existing body of knowledge in the fields of Individual Planning, Inclusive Education and Comparative Education.

This study advances our knowledge of individual planning as a response to pupil diversity. The field of individual planning is characterised by single-country studies which take for granted the meaning of individual education plans (IEPs) and the organisation of education systems (For example Hirsh 2012; Lee-Tarver 2006; Rose et al. 2012; Andreasson et al. 2013; Sanches-Ferreira et al. 2013). In addition, these studies tend to adopt a ‘special needs education’ perspective. My work contributes to this field by looking at individual planning beyond ‘special needs’ and beyond national boundaries. I have shown that individual planning assumes different forms and roles which are lacking in the literature. My work contributes to this body of knowledge by illustrating how IEPs are only one form of individual planning amongst others. It also demonstrates that not only pupils ‘with SEN’ have individual planning. Therefore, by using this new approach to researching individual planning, the empirical findings provide a new understanding of the use of its use in schools in England and Portugal.

The second contribution adds to the body of knowledge in the field of inclusive education. This field is dominated by a concern about equity in the
responses of educational systems to pupils ‘with SEN’ and pupils ‘at risk’ of experiencing barriers to their learning and participation in school. My work contributes to this field by providing evidence of the limitations of individual planning in developing inclusive educational practices. The phenomenon of individual planning as I have described it in this study perpetuates the dichotomous view of pupils, by reinforcing notions of most/some, and normality/ difference. My novel approach to individual planning, beyond the boundaries of ‘special needs’, allowed looking across pupils and identifying which aspects of diversity were considered relevant by teachers. The precedence given to ‘ability’ differences by teachers extends existing theorisations about pupil diversity in education (Bartolo et al. 2007; Booth 2003; Florian 2012; OECD 2005). Additionally, it led me to question the value of the concept of SEN to the field of inclusive education.

The literature on inclusion is characterised by a naively optimistic view of the possibilities of ‘adhocracy’ and ‘problem-solving’ (Skrtic 1991a; Ainscow 1991a). On the contrary, my work has found a use of problem-solving which is much more formulaic. Teachers use a limited repertoire of conceptualisations and responses to pupil diversity. And therefore, individual planning is part of a process of finding a ‘reasonable fit’ between the pupils’ perceived needs and the repertoire of responses available to teachers within a certain context.

My third contribution to knowledge adds to the field of comparative studies in education. While quantitative comparative studies are increasingly common (e.g. PISA), comparative case-studies that look beyond national boundaries are extremely rare. This study has shown that comparative studies have a vast potential to research in education. Within a case-study design, comparing between cases requires depth in the level of understanding of each case. In doing research in education, comparing
between cases cross-nationally, requires the same level of understanding of each context. Besides, it entails being able to think critically about the standpoints in each context. This provides researchers with ‘interruptions to make the familiar unfamiliar’ (Ainscow et al. 2012; Ainscow 2007). And it compels to questioning their own ‘enculturation’ (Ore 2003). By using a comparative study, I was able to develop an understanding of the way diversity is conceptualised and responded to across cultures and educational systems. This approach revealed the pervasive influence of national policy on teacher thinking and school practice.

When referring to methodological challenges of comparative research in the field of inclusive education (D’Alessio & Watkins 2009), my work has highlighted the difficulties of translation and interpretation (Booth & Ainscow 1998), and it reiterates the requirement to define the terminologies used (for example SEN, inclusion, IEP). This study contributes to the body of knowledge by suggesting the use of broad research concepts with a view to defining them in context. Cross-national empirical studies can contribute to the field by discussing the definitions of a concept across contexts. Rather than trying to find the ‘universal’ meaning of a concept, examining the concept across contexts has the potential to reveal important cultural and contextual aspects. By using the concept of ‘individual planning’ I was able to explore what aspects of diversity were considered relevant by teachers for lesson planning and teaching purposes.

Finally, the role of the researcher in comparative studies is of the utmost importance. My fluency in both languages and my professional experience of schools in both countries put me in an advantageous position to undertake this study. These aspects allowed me to explore nuances in the way practitioners described pupils and conceptualised diversity. What is more, feeling and being perceived as ‘a foreigner’ in both contexts allowed me to
ask basic questions about the phenomenon of individual planning without being seen as ‘the expert’. This made teachers feel less threatened and more confident and authentic. This is beneficial when researching underlying assumptions about the notions of ‘normality’ and ‘difference’.

8.3 Implications for policy and practice

School systems in different parts of the world have so far been unsuccessful in teaching all children (Ainscow 1991a, p.1)

Despite research and scholars presenting evidence to back up changes to the way school systems work. As I have discussed throughout this thesis, the changes made to educational policy function through an ‘add-on’ approach. Rather than rethinking the goals of schooling and restructuring educational systems in face of the present context. This study has a number of important implications for future policy and practice. Based on my review of the existing literature and on the analysis of the empirical findings of this study I propose that this thesis has a number of implications for practitioners, school leaders, policy makers, teacher training and the academic community.

In the light of the impact of context in the process of conceptualising pupil diversity, practitioners should be critical of their assumptions about normality and difference. The notion of ‘difference’ should be conceptualised as the result of an interaction between the characteristics of schools and the characteristics of individual pupils. Therefore, teachers should consider how their values, their teaching practices and their underlying thinking about diversity impact on pupils. Teacher training could also play a role in this process, by giving practitioners the opportunities to engage with the theoretical concepts of diversity, difference, homogeneity and heterogeneity. Additionally, the impact of context presented in this study, has implications for school leaders. Some models of leadership may have the potential to
create more an inclusive school ethos by challenging ‘bell-curve thinking’ and the conceptualisation of the school population as ‘most/some’. These are models that foster the practitioners’ flexibility and inventiveness. Furthermore, they encourage teachers to use diversity as a resource by seeing past ability ‘difference’.

Given the formulaic problem-approach to diversity found in schools, this study has implications for school leaders, teacher training and policy makers. School leaders should create times and spaces for collaborative work between practitioners to problem-solve and develop wider repertoires having the pupils as a starting point and based on the specific school context. Teacher training should provide examples of ‘repertoires’ of good practice and give the opportunity for training teachers to experience managing classes with diverse pupils. Policy makers should be aware that the way concepts and definitions are presented in policies is important as they influence the teachers’ repertoires and ultimately the experiences of schooling for pupils; and in some cases in their future lives.

Despite claims that repertoires are not useful given the ‘diverse and changing set of student needs’ (Skrtic 1991a), the existence of repertoires critically developed to respond to pupil diversity can be useful tools to teachers. However, repertoires need to be wider, more flexible and, aimed at all pupils not dependant on ‘labels’ assigned to pupils and not only to pupils perceived as ‘needing’ individualised responses.

Taking into consideration the pervasive influence of policy in the way teachers conceptualise and respond to pupil diversity presented in this thesis, it has a very strong implication for policy makers. Financial resources have a direct impact on how difference is responded to in schools. Financial resources are also limited, and the way they are managed is often based on
political and economic grounds. Policy makers should make an attempt to minimise the impact of issues and concepts related to funding on educational issues. The use of certain categorical labels associated to allocation of extra resources has an impact in the conceptualisation of pupils’ differences.

Finally, in the light of the findings presented in this thesis the research community should analyse critically the role of individual planning to effectively respond to pupil diversity in a context of aiming to create more inclusive and equitable practices.

8.4 Evaluation of the study and further research

To conclude this chapter, I will evaluate the strengths and limitations of my study, while making suggestions for further research. This study was based on a complex and rich case study design which aimed to look at who were the pupils identified by their teacher as needing individualised responses, what forms of individual planning and provision were used. I believe the rich empirical data collected could allow for other analyses and other conclusions could have been reached. For example issues around staff training, management and cooperation in relation to responding to different pupils in an inclusive and equitable way; the dominance of literacy and numeracy in the interventions proposed and when making judgements about pupil ability; the existing resources in each country, and variability between local areas (e.g. Local authorities in England). However, this thesis presents the outcome of a research process based on the aims set initially. By answering the three research questions I outline my perspectives on individual planning, on the conceptualisation and management of pupil
diversity and ultimately on the construction of the notion of educational
difference in schools in England and Portugal.

A number of important limitations need to be considered. First, the study is
limited by the lack of follow-up information on some of the pupils, namely
three pupils who went to Elephant High School. Although this lack of
information on six pupils rendered the sample poorer than it would have
been otherwise, the fact that data saturation was reached in reassuring
maximising reliability of the data and resulting analysis and conclusions.
The sample attrition which was associated with two factors: some pupils
moving away from the area where they lived and leaving the schools they
attended on one hand, and on the other hand, the difficulty of securing
access and establishing a trusting relationship with a staff member at
Elephant High School. This was a very large secondary school, which had
recently come out ‘being in special measures’, and was in the process of
appointing a new head teacher. Also, the head of learning for Year 7 was a
young teacher who had not been in the school for very long. This
unfortunate set of circumstances resulted in difficulties in getting a response
from the school, being received by a member of staff, and collecting data on
individual pupil cases. Even though pupil identity was protected by the use
of the Unique Pupil Number and pseudonyms which implied I would not
know ‘who’ the pupils were.

Secondly, the study used a convenience sample that was based on my
previous knowledge of the schools and recommendation from university
staff in both countries. I chose to look at schools that were perceived as being
effective in responding to pupil diversity so I did not aim to select a
representative sample that would capture the variations existing in each
country. This implies that the generalizability of these results is subject to
certain limitations.
Thirdly, the current investigation used a cross-national comparative design which did, in a sense, limit the depth of analysis expected from a case-study. This was compensated in two ways: by the use of case vignettes which aimed to illustrate the ‘real-life context’ of the data collected. And on the other hand, by the possibility to compare a breadth of data to look for patterns, similarities and differences and develop an in-depth understanding of the impact of socio-cultural, economic and political contexts in the assumptions held by teachers about the notions of normality and difference.

Despite these limitations, this study has achieved to analyse the phenomenon of individual planning beyond national boundaries. This allowed me to understand the impact of contextual factors and to theorise how the notion of ‘educational difference’ is constructed. Furthermore, the analysis of the similarities and differences between England and Portugal provided me the opportunity to develop theoretical frameworks about the way schools respond to pupil diversity.

In a future study it would be appropriate to explore whether the theoretical frameworks of conceptualising and responding to pupil diversity I propose are applicable to other schools within England and Portugal, and to other national systems.

Additionally, in the case of England it would be interesting to explore the impact of the replacement of the 3-level system (SA, SA+, Stat) by a single category of SEN in the 2014 Code of Practice on the teachers’ repertoires.

Another interesting focus for further research would be to look at how the notion of difference is constructed by pupils. One of the ways this could be achieved is through sociometry. This could provide rich data which could be analysed in conjunction to the teachers and ‘system’ conceptualisations.
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Appendix 1. Interview Guide – Pilot Study

Interview guide - Eagle Primary School

SENCO:
1. Who is identified as having SEN?
   1.1. Who identifies?
2. What does the school do to cater for the different needs of students?
3. What tools/strategies are used?
4. Who has IEP?
   4.1. Why?
5. What (educational) aims are present in IEPs?
   5.1. General aims and principles of curriculum
6. Whose aims? Who is involved:
   6.1. Student involvement/role?
   6.2. Parent/family involvement/role?
7. What areas are expected in IEPs?
   7.1. areas of learning
   7.2. their goals and objectives
   7.3. are they structured in subjects
   7.4. specific programme of study objectives
   7.5. pedagogic strategies
8. How do IEPs relate to mainstream curriculum?
   8.1. Are parts of national curriculum in IEPs?
   8.2. What parts are/aren’t and why?
   8.3. How relate do they relate to educational aims to all students?
9. How do IEPs relate to assessment/assessment recording?
   9.1. How are SEN students assessed?
10. What difference does having an IEP make?
11. What differences in practice:
    11.1. for the student
    11.2. for the teacher
    11.3. for TAs
12. How are resources allocated?
13. Are there any doubt/dilemmas in terms of provision for these students? Which?

Collect:
- Statistics on School Action, School Action +, Statements
- other forms of categorisation used in the school
- tools for planning (IEPs, others)

Ines Alves
PhD student
Appendix 2. Information sheet for potential participants

Individual planning and the construction of educational difference

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a study conducted by a PhD student of the University of Manchester, with the aim of exploring the needs and educational decisions regarding students who have some form of individual planning. Before you decide 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. 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?
Ines Figueiredo Alves, School of Education, University of Manchester

Title of the study
Individual planning and the construction of educational difference – who needs some form of individual planning and provision? What forms of individual planning and provision are used?

What is the aim of the study?
The aim of the study is to explore mechanisms of construction of difference in education through the need for individual planning and provision for some students. By individual planning it includes all forms of written formal plan for provision different from the one planned for the majority of the students, which can be done individually or in a group, on a regular basis. It does not have to be a dedicated document such as an IEP, neither it will refer only to plans created for students with disabilities or identified SEN. The researcher hopes to answer the questions: Who has some form of individual planning? What forms of individual planning are used in different contexts? What interventions do these plans propose?

Why have I been chosen?
Your school was identified as having good practice regarding individual planning and provision. Other members of staff of your school will also be involved. Additionally, participants of other schools will be asked to take part in this study.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?
You would be asked to take part in a 20-60 minutes interview, talking about your school/class practices regarding individual planning and provision. You would also be asked to provide examples of individual planning used, in anonymised form. These activities should not create risk or discomfort to you and will be scheduled according to your possibilities and preferences.

What happens to the data collected?
Data collected will be kept and analysed by the researcher, who might discuss them with her supervisors. After being anonymised the data collected might be used in the researcher’s thesis or in academic publications.

How is confidentiality maintained?
Data will be anonymised initially, all original names (of schools and participants) will be removed and pseudonyms will be used as a means of breaking the link between data and identifiable individuals. Original names will be kept in separate documents and all files (including audio-recordings) will be password protected, and only the researcher will know the latter. Data will be destroyed no later than ten years after continuation of the degree result.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?
It is up to you to decide whether or not 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.
Appendix 3. Example of a section of analysed transcript
I: And in terms of the impact of her being in the group in terms of planning, does she need to have completely different things?
T: No, no, she does the same work, like I say she is only a little bit behind, so she goes off to the other classes, she wouldn't be on the bottom table she probably more likely be on the middle or the top tables, it's just more differentiated in terms of resources, she might use, because it's visual, so she has like different books and things, and worksheets might be enlarged, and you do maths she has a special ruler and markings are clearer and it's that kind of thing.
(I: so it's more to do with...) T: Resources, yes to aid her...

I: In terms of human resources does she have?
T: No she has, she has a lady that comes in, from the sensory support service, and she comes in every fortnight, just checks how she's doing, observes her in the lessons, gives me some feedback, of everything I might need to do, you know, to help her learning, so for example we do map work, she said make it darker for her so it's easier to see, and things like that. And she'll, she'll make more resources for us to work with her in that session that she comes in. So that's pretty much the support she gets.
(I: so again it's more to do with resources...) T: Yes, yeah, she's not some one who really lowers your... And maybe a teacher working, no, she's much more independent than that, and she doesn't need someone with her all the time.

I: Are there other students, does she have an IEP or some form of individual planning at the moment?
T: Yes, she has her own, she has her own IEP.
I: Are there other kids with IEP he's in the classroom?
T: Yes, yes.
I: Could you just briefly tell me how they are and compare them to Anita?
T: I've got other children with IEP's, but, she's the only one in this class who is, more medical, sort of sensory or physical needs, most my other ones are here for cognition and learning, so you know, quite low in reading and writing, because hers is, because she's on, she's a little bit low but it's mainly this one here... I did have a boy who is left now, he was on... he had autism, and there was more to do with the way... He communicated with adults. (I: was it Andrew?) Yes, yes but he's left now. They were all completely, every one, that's why they're individual, there are completely different in terms of what they need, their help they need, that adult support and the resources so.... That's how it has to be, individual for them really.

I: How was it in terms of having him in the classroom? Was it completely different in terms of what you needed to do?
T: Yes, I mean, Adam had settled quite well: to be honest, he had all these things in place about being really consistent, giving him routines, explaining what was going to happen before we did it so he know what to expect. It was more just verbal instructions, and making sure what we expected of him, he needed to be told very specifically what to do, I want you to go in front of da da da rather than just get in the line. Really specific. That he had come a long way and it's a shame really, that he's had to go and settle somewhere else now. So, they are all very different, that children on the IEP's, they're all...
I: What kind of things do you see an IEPs?
T: What we tend to do, we do a broad target, of what we want them to develop, so for her its continue to build her comprehension skills and an continue to develop her confidence and independence, and then we just have strategies of what we will do and do things will do to meet those targets so. She has a prior learning group because we said her concentration is quite poor, and she'll learn a little bit about what gonna do before we had the lesson takes place, so we're doing science electricity, she might, go out for 20 minutes in the morning a few other children, or a bit of a brief intro and then we'll do the lesson and she's got some knowledge of what, so it's not or could completely new to her. So... And then obviously, we just had the other... Sensory stuff from the support from Tricia, we just keep it up to date for that with all resources and things.

So in terms of other people involved? It's basically myself, had Jenny and Trish are from the sensory support unit.
And in terms of having TA's?
Yes, the TAs will help her like any other child, we just say the TA's are here to assist and should, if she's on a table where a TA is working she'll get the same help as everybody else. But not, like some children might have someone working with them fulltime, all the time, but she doesn't have that, no.

I: There's a lot of different pupils doing different things in different times, how does the school manage both resources, people in terms of individual planning?
It's all quite timetabled, so the teaching assistants, we always have the timetables... Let me just grab one... This is miss X and she works with lots of children on IEP's. Mainly for recognition and learning, she'll have times and where she's going to different classes, who she's working with, what she's focusing in. So in class literacy support, wave III Group, booster group, reading group, so... Everybody's time knows where they are, and then Jenny obviously monitors, there is staff meetings, SEN meetings to see if they need more support, do they need some more resources? Is that working for them, we have meetings with the parents, get those involved to see how they feel, if they want more from us... So pretty much really.

I: So is this called the IEP?
T: Yes that's the individual education plan, yes.
I: Do you know why this kind of thing is used? Is it useful for you in terms of knowing...
T: Yes, it's so we know exactly, what their area of needs is, and making sure we're meeting that area of need so... if you're coming to a new class you don't know the children so you need to set up one of these so you can ensure you're making sure you're using the strategies, and then when you have your next meeting, 'cause you review this, you might actually think: 'She's come long way and she doesn't need that any more'. We might say: 'Actually, we need to get some more larger groups, and she needs some work in this subject'. So it's a chance for you to make sure that it's being monitored and followed through basically. So it's a working document, we do use them.

I: So would you say that mainly with Anita it's focusing on her needs in terms of...
T: Physical needs, yes, it is, I do, because of, I think, she's a bit of this as well because... There is... She has a lot of troubled home life as well, I don't really know the 'ins' and 'outs' of it but, there is no confidence there, there's been [??] at home, she always seems very upset and emotional, so at the next meet up, we find this up with Jenny, so we are keeping an eye on it, we've had her mum in and things like that. I just worry about that side more, because she just seems quite sad sometimes, she puts quite a lot of messages in the box, says she has no one to play with, and it's all things like that, so it's just... It's just keeping an eye really, and, and do everything that we can do to tackle that really.
I: So what interventions does she have? You told me about a booster group...
T: Yes she does, she does the prior learning group, which is to raise her confidence and encourage participation, to put her hand up and things like that.
I: Are there other children in that group?
T: [?] The ones that don't participate, the ones that have poor concentration, you teach them something you go back to the table and they can't remember, mainly those with poor memory skills. It's usually about six in a group, and it's usually Mrs. X, she's a special needs teaching assistant from Lancaster and she will take them for 20 minutes, and the SENCO will provide her with what we're doing this term, I give her the lesson plans and things, and she can go through what's being done and what will be done and it does work, it does help.
I: When do these sessions happen?
T: Once a week, yes once a week.
I: Is it during your class?
T: No, no, usually probably will be in assembly time. When the other children are in assembly, they will probably do that 20 minutes, so that hopefully when they go to the lesson even that day or the other day they still remember little something about the lesson, rather than it all being bombarded to them.

I: Are there any other things that she has?
T: We've put here extra support in English and maths but she doesn't have the individual one, she, it's just that she's in the groups where they have extra TA support so she can access the help if she needs it. And then the work is differentiated according to her ability. And then like we said it's... The support teacher comes in once in a fortnight.
I: And what type of differentiated work would she have?
T: She would have the same of that table, if you see what I mean, so... If we're in a maths lesson and her table, so it's just that it would be set to her ability in that subject.

I: How does it work in terms of assessment? And how are the different groups and different targets... It something that in Portugal they really really struggle...
T: It's hard, because I don't teach her for literacy and maths, which are the main two in which we do a lot of assessment, it's hard but what we do is called APP, so what we do, we monitor our children through that, so I: What is it?
T: Oh, it's really, it's basically a government initiative where we track the children with all these objectives then we track where they are, it's levels as well, are they secure, are they nearly there, are they a high level and it's basically looking at all the objectives and then highlight which ones they have met basically. And that's what, her teachers will do in those lessons, but I don't do that because I don't... They will pass information on to me and then we all get together as a team, I will look at where they were last term, where they are now, where we want them to be, and that's basically how you do the assessment.
I: So that comes from government policy?
T: Yes, yes, yeah.
Appendix 4. Example of Tree Node structure
### Appendix 5. Year 2/ Year 3 pupils as described by school staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagle primary school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Behaviour issues</td>
<td>Autism (left school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Medical needs, detached retinas, poor eyesight</td>
<td>Medical/ sensory/ physical needs, (confidence, attention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>EAL recently arrived from Germany</td>
<td>integrated into year three, without any additional needs (...), she’s actually excelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faruhk</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Physical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaf</td>
<td>vulnerable family, family and behaviour issues (very tall – intimidating)</td>
<td>Needs structure, difficulties in playtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eucalyptus primary school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Brightest girl in class, white British, I think she’s gifted and talented</td>
<td>Above average on everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olene</td>
<td>Polish, EAL/ SEN, maths slightly below average so isn’t a worry</td>
<td>IEP numeracy, is EAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Black African, signs of dyscalculia, SEN for numeracy, moderate learning difficulties, school action, assessment planned for Year 3</td>
<td>Tested and doesn’t have dyscalculia, below average in literacy, problem with numeracy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>White British, school action plus, cognitive tests language at 3 years 4 months, problems with parental support</td>
<td>Problem is attendance, much below where she should be, has IEP, works with EAL children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiu</td>
<td>Chinese, selective mutism, SEN, school action plus</td>
<td>IEP for speech and language, Bottom end of average in literacy, top end of average in numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milos</td>
<td>From Slovakia, had no schooling, didn’t know a book was for reading, couldn’t speak English, couldn’t understand the structure of a school day or that children sit down, gypsy Romanian, school action, assessment planned for Year 3</td>
<td>Left school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6. Year 6/ Year 7 pupils as described by school staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Y6</strong></th>
<th><strong>Y7</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagle primary school – various secondary schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Came from a different local authority, child protection issues, Asperger's, on the autistic spectrum, statement of SEN</td>
<td>Specific learning difficulties, very intelligent, doesn't like to be different, thinks tests are to make him look stupid, very hard on himself, gets very cross, screams, bangs head on the table, you learn something new about him every day, not consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Problems with behaviour, no friends, making friends is chasing, punching, kiss them; before in lower set, now top sets</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan</td>
<td>Not SEN but really below-average, issues of attendance, very shy, booster child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette</td>
<td>Booster child, border SEN but not quite there, gaps in learning, self-conscious: a lot taller than the other girls, reached puberty quite early</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah</td>
<td>Above average, EAL</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>SA+, SEN, Year 2/3 level, no SEN statement, will never catch up with peers, I don't know what it is but she's just one of those children who find very hard to access and process things</td>
<td>SA+, memory difficulties, very immature, has no idea she's so poor, under the old way of defining additional needs: a classic moderate learning difficulties child, 80 IQ, very supportive family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eucalyptus primary school – various secondary schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Born very premature, it might be developmental, immature</td>
<td>Academically he's middle; needs a pushing; not literacy or numeracy - family background problem, brothers in and out of prison; concentration and social/ emotional aspects of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart and Sharon very similar, SEN in literacy and numeracy, low attainers; find learning difficult, unlikely they'll work at average level; can cope with most things in the lesson but not everything; not able enough; very supportive families</td>
<td>Background has influence; lots of agencies involved; parents need help, not good role models, has been babied, numeracy and literacy difficulties; SA+; will never be top set child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlee</td>
<td>EAL, joined this year; 1st language German, working at average level, picked everything up fast, quite gifted; will probably overtake some of her peers Marlee perhaps more intelligent or faster learner, has overtaken Nadia</td>
<td>EAL, first in mixed ability group but struggling and was moved to lower; maths is very weak, but again it's the English; father and mother very supportive, always asking for extra work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>EAL; 1st language Polish; after 2 years English still very poor, maths quite poor, generally poor, SEN? is the language the barrier or other barriers to learning</td>
<td>Literacy concerns (initial concern – lower level of SEN register – below SA, SA+), reading age 8.5 spelling age 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik</td>
<td>Gifted and talented, above average</td>
<td>In higher set, quite high achieving pupil, at same level with set peers; good mannered, very polite; reading age 15.3, spelling age 12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern</td>
<td>Statement, literacy very difficult, very poor motor skills, understands he's not as good in literacy as everybody else, very switched off from the subject</td>
<td>Statement, levels low but quite good really, no need for scribe, support during break time because fights; had exclusions for fighting; behaviour, attendance, punctuality problematic; no family support; anti-social behaviour outside school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individual Education Plan

**SEN Status - Statement of Educational Needs**

**Barrier Free Teacher Assistant**

**Year 3**

**D.O.B. 14.11.02**

**Date September 2010**

**Review Date January 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions/Strategies</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Physical Needs</td>
<td>Fine Motor Skills Programme - Writing without Tears 2 x 25 minutes per week</td>
<td>Letters are correctly formed and the orientation and size has improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop Faizan fine and gross</td>
<td>To follow with Write From the Start handwriting programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motor skills</td>
<td>Mrs H (play leader) to target and encourage him to join in various team play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities such as cricket, rounders, football, volleyball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(record is kept of his participation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure uses the building and making equipment to support fine motor skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BF support in Gym, Dance and PE to supervise and observe his progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BF TA/Teacher To monitor mobility around the school and the playground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is independently choosing different activities at playtime without prompting and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has developed a wider friendship group including boys and girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is able to access all PE lessons at his level and challenges are planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any falls or difficulties with mobility are recorded and reported to class teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>BF TA to monitor lunchtimes to ensure [REDACTED] is eating his lunch and having sufficient fluid intake at lunch and throughout the day.</td>
<td>Parents. [REDACTED] eats his lunch provided. Any changes in appetite to be recorded and reported to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop fluency in speech</td>
<td>[REDACTED] to attend Speech and Language Clinic 1 x weekly with parents Recommended speech exercises to be practised in school To encourage class and group participation BF TA to observe and monitor communication in the classroom environment</td>
<td>[REDACTED] speech begins to become fluent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social /Emotional</td>
<td>Mrs [REDACTED] (play leader) to encourage social interaction at playtimes through team and small group games Class teacher to monitor [REDACTED]'s friendship group. BF TA to observe [REDACTED]'s social interaction in the playground Encourage [REDACTED] to use the message box to voice positive and negative experiences.</td>
<td>[REDACTED] develops a wider friendship group including boys and girls. [REDACTED] initiates interaction. [REDACTED] reports that he feels happy and safe at breaktimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td><strong>In class support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA/Teacher to guide group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To apply phonics knowledge to all his reading (a-e, i-e, o-e, u-e, e-e/zh/ph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To apply known spelling patterns in his independent writing - target words in class / spelling lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To identify his mistakes when reading his writing back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To consistently use finger spaces in all writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can form letters correctly with consistency in size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage participation in class and group sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage independence in set tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn key words from target list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Numeracy</strong></th>
<th><strong>3 x 15 minutes 1:1 support</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Formation of numbers - through numbers in the sand/ tracing / copying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will support in recording work in class and help him develop pace and confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To learn number bonds to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using fingers - I have 4 you have?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use different colour cubes to make number sentences to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm thinking of a number I add 5 my answer is 10 (use a number line)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***continues to make progress with reading and progresses through reading baskets***

That he learns and uses targeted spellings in his independent writing.
That he uses full stops and letters consistently in his independent writing.
That his handwriting is clear and legible and correctly spaced.

That ***is able to form numbers correctly and his pace of recording increases.***

Knows number bonds to 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Educational Needs Record</th>
<th>Individual Education Plan</th>
<th>Form SEN 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix 8.</strong> IEP – Broad Targets, Anita, Year 3, Eagle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broad targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil name</th>
<th>Unique Pupil Number</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Year group</th>
<th>October 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1. Areas of Need** Please tick relevant area(s) of need (one or more).

- **A. Cognition and Learning**
- **B. Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulty**
- **C. Communication and Interaction Needs**
- **D. Sensory and/or Physical Needs**

**2. Broad target**

To continue to develop comprehension skills. To develop confidence and independence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She is a very kind and caring girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She tries hard in lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is aware of her needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil's views:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI teacher works one session 1 x every 2 weeks to provide adapted materials in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra TA support in literacy and maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x 20 minute session prior learning group focus on main topic area to raise confidence and encourage participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor well being and participation/make parent message box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage friendship group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested (class) strategies to be used:**

- Reading board – to support the book
- Magnifying glass
- Adapted rulers
- Adapted resources
- Sits in close proximity to white board

> **3. How can parent/carer support pupil at home?**

Support with homework and reading

**4. Monitoring and assessment.** What, when and who.

- Class teacher
- TA
- SENCO

**5. Next review date**

January 10

**6. Who to action review**

- SENCO
- Class teacher
- TA
### Individual Education Plan

**Name**: Sharon  
**DOB**: 12.5.98  
**Year**: 6  
**Class Teacher**: Mrs A.  
**Area/s of concern**: Literacy and Numeracy  
**Support by**: Proposed Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Achievement Criteria</th>
<th>Possible resources and techniques</th>
<th>Possible strategies for use in class</th>
<th>Ideas for support teacher / assistant</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 To write a short account correctly punctuated with full stops and capital letters.</td>
<td>1 Accurate on three separate occasions.</td>
<td>1 Worksheets, Story cards.</td>
<td>1 Story telling approach. Provide exercises for Sharon to punctuate. Encourage Sharon to think about punctuation when writing.</td>
<td>1 Encourage Sharon to read her work aloud with intonation and notice where pauses occur.</td>
<td>1 Sharon can punctuate a short account accurately with full stops and capital letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To identify non-fiction genres by their features.</td>
<td>2 Accurate answers on three separate occasions.</td>
<td>2 Variety of texts. Examples of page layouts.</td>
<td>2 Draw attention to differences between texts when reading aloud. Display genre features.</td>
<td>2 Discuss differences between content and style of texts, relevant illustrations etc.</td>
<td>2 Sharon knows the features of a range of non-fiction genres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 To know and use doubles up to double 10.</td>
<td>3 Accurate on three separate occasions.</td>
<td>3 Sequences of numbers with some missing. Quick fire questions. Links made with 2 times tables.</td>
<td>3 Set activities to practise counting on and back in steps. Check that the terms 'twice', 'double' are known.</td>
<td>3 Sharon knows and uses doubles up to double 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent / carer contribution** Help Sharon to learn the story and notice where the full stops go. Encourage Sharon to read a variety of texts. Chant tables with Sharon. Ask questions out of sequence.

**Student’s contribution** Take care when writing. To read a variety of non-fiction texts and think about the text type. Answer questions out of sequence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Achievement Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 To write a short account correctly punctuated with full stops and capital letters.</td>
<td>1 Accurate on three separate occasions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To identify non-fiction genres by their features.</td>
<td>2 Accurate answers on three separate occasions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 To know and use doubles up to double 10.</td>
<td>3 Accurate on three separate occasions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**

**Recommendations**

**New Aims**

**Next Review**
# Appendix 10. IEP, Eric, Year 7, Emu High School

## INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN

**Name of Student:**

**Date of Commencement:** Sept 2010

**Form:** 7RN

**Review Date:** 13 Jan 2011

### STATEMENT

### NEEDS: Communication and interaction ASD

#### FOCUS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING / SOCIAL EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOUR NEEDS:

- Has a diagnosis of Asperger’s Syndrome (September 2007), with associated difficulties of rule-based behaviours and routines which he imposes on himself. He is intelligent and has a broad vocabulary but when anxious or unsure he can display problems with speaking; similar to a stutter. This can be accompanied by rocking backwards and pulling at his hair and face. His spoken language can be precise; his understanding of language is extremely literal. When calm he is able to speak.

- 's cognitive abilities are good and his reading and spelling ages are in excess of his chronological age.

- In Maths, he is capable and will accurately use mental methods of calculation but is reluctant to show working out. This makes it difficult for him to solve problems that have several steps. He finds Algebra a particularly frustrating activity.

- Tasks generally need to be highly differentiated. Sometimes finds it difficult to understand what he has read, to understand the concept of making notes, drawing mind maps, similies, nuances, having opinions, choices, feelings and open ended questions.

- Cannot easily work in a group situation (unless wishes to participate) and finds Dance impossible.

- He has difficulty recording his ideas in writing, some of which is due to perfectionism about presentation. He wants to do well at school and works hard but his insistence on his own high standards can make him frustrated and tired. He often feels he has made no progress since leaving Wales in 2009.

- Needs a high level of support to ensure that he understands instructions and work requirements. If he does become confused he can react noisily and this can escalate into kicking furniture, screaming and shouting.

- Is able to work in a structured group situation but would like to form individual relationships with his peers. He maybe wary of interaction with strangers. He is a target for teasing and can respond aggressively rather than seeking adult help.

- Can find it difficult to control his emotional responses when affected by anxiety. His need for perfection affects his ability to move on. It is important to give enough time and support so that he can reach his potential and access the KS3 curriculum at an appropriate level commensurate with his intelligence. If continues to suffer from recurring extreme stress anxiety, fear of failure and performance issues there may be physical and psychological effects.

### Strengths and interests:

- Reading, cycling, being in the countryside, watching factual TV programmes especially science and History and watching DVD's.

### TEST RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATs KS2</th>
<th>T/A</th>
<th>English 2</th>
<th>Maths 2</th>
<th>Science 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRT Reading Test</th>
<th>Verbal Score</th>
<th>NFER Reasoning Test</th>
<th>Non-verbal Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNED ACTION (taking account of - preferred learning style, student's views)

**To help learning:**

- Scores 127 on the General Ability Index but may not perform to his potential due to perfectionism and rule based behaviour. He does not like to be singled out as being different in class. He is easily overwhelmed in his ability to start a task and with the amount of work due to his need to produce a perfect piece of work.

- Provide a seat in class directly in front of the whiteboard (front on) either at the front, middle or back of the class but where there is space to move and if necessary leave the classroom.

- Use the ‘traffic light system’ to guide and the TA when he may need to leave the lesson. There is a copy of the system at the back of his planner. When not coping well in the classroom, the teacher should point to either the amber/red colour as a signal to.

- TAs supporting need to use a white board in the lesson to provide with a visual timetable of the events going to take place in the lesson, with suggested time limits. This is to encourage to move on and complete all tasks in the lesson.

- Provide print outs of class work, homework tasks (which would normally be copied from the board) to alleviate making mistakes in his copying and allow him extra time to start and complete the actual work.
• Provide frameworks to help start a piece of work
• Differentiate the quantity of written work is expected to complete. It may be useful at certain times for the TA to act as a scribe.
• All oral participation in class needs to be sensitively managed.
• Needs warning of any changes to his routine well in advance and time available for TA/BI to complete a social story with Edward to cover the forth coming event. Give TA/BI plans of the changes to his routine to enable them to do this.
• Speech and language therapist is to advise staff on writing social stories in January 2011.
• Boost his confidence and praise him continually to raise his self-esteem. He continually feels he is making no progress.

Additional support:
• Key Support Worker, Full time support from two TAs.
• Home school book (through Joe Fleming).
• Use of locker to store PE kit etc.
• Withdrawn by learning support teacher BI to help to work on:
  Social language skills and support to access academic and social curriculum
  Social interaction and social communication skills to encourage inclusion with peers through a social circle
  Greater independence and self help skills
• Quiet place in the Learning Support Base for when he feels stressed, needs some space or other students become too distracted by his noise level.
• has been withdrawn from music, art and enquiry skills to work in the base to provide catch up time and time to de stress. Subject teachers need to provide copies of text books (kept in OG7) to enable to do the catch up work.

How TAs can be helped in supporting?
Provide TA with:
• a place where the TA can sit that allows them to assist and support
• a description of the content of a forthcoming lesson to enable TA to adapt worksheets or whiteboard tasks so can access and complete the tasks.

BROAD TARGETS
• To develop to initiate conversations
• To support him in accessing the academic and social curriculum

(ILP containing detailed short term targets will be written by subject teacher and student where targets are additional to or different from the usual differentiated curriculum)

HOW CAN PARENTS / CARERS SUPPORT STUDENT AT HOME
• Keep in contact with school through his form teacher, Learning Support Teacher (Mrs ) and Key worker through home school book, letter, emails or phone calls.
• Arrange a regular homework time and check planner for letters and messages
• Check equipment and help prepare his bag for the next day

MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT
Monitored and reviewed annually by Learning Support Team/Pastoral Support Team/Inclusion Coordinator
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## INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Steps</th>
<th>Target 1</th>
<th>Target 2</th>
<th>Target 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment, planning and review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping for teaching purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional human resources</td>
<td>TA SENCO</td>
<td>TA SENCO</td>
<td>TA SENCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead TA</td>
<td>Lead TA</td>
<td>Lead TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix 11.**

IBP, Generic, Elm Academy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Shared learning and teaching</th>
<th>Plenary</th>
<th>Assessment criteria including AFL</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning (including differentiation)</td>
<td>Guided writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BOOSTER DAY 5</td>
<td>Design a picture revision page for play scripts. <em>Copy into revision books</em>, leaving first 10 pages free. Can more features be added for level 5’s?</td>
<td>Begin reading revision onto wall?? Children to copy that part into books. Teachers to mark homework. AFL writing with SATs level and development point.</td>
<td>AFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect homework - model writing the rest of the scene using a pupil’s plan, (PATO, VCOP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After break give SATs task where the summary of a short story is presented: Sarah and Ben... Task - to continue writing scene 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA to support Marlee/Aaliyah; MS with Nadia/Michal- check understanding of task and steps they should go through; A’OH with Sharon/Alice- go through task in steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SATs task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review AFL marking and improve.</td>
<td>Give out homework. Children to plan explanation using what they know about brushing teeth - make clear this is explaining rather than instructing.</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Give out spellings - ie and ei (GCP spelling book 3, pgs. 15-16)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show enlarged copy of water explanation from GCP writing rules book (pgs. 60-61). Teacher to model how to annotate features. Focus on 2 features - layout and genre features. Colour code features using a key. Give pairs ‘How we hear’ explanation. Read as a class - ask authorial intent questions first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan brushing teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Then mixed ability pairs to annotate as shown referring to text type features and layout. Show WAGOLL. Why are the features there? What do they do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spellings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plan brushing teeth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Use homework to model writing an explanation about how to brush teeth.  
Watch and re-watch ‘The shirt machine’ from the renewed framework. Present the picture on the notebook file.  
Ask children in pairs, to capture a part of the machine (from the picture) that interests them. Ask them to discuss what it might be called, what it might do and how it might work. Through collaborative work children create a detailed diagram of their chosen part of the shirt machine, labelling and discussing how this section works. This oral rehearsal will act as a structure to support their writing.  
**Model this first – gather nouns and verbs.** |
|---|---|
| **WALT:** to use a picture to explain | **Add to technical language** children are using and display:  
Verbs - turn, pull, screw, twist, pour, rotate, tighten, undo, push,  
Nouns - lever, button, pipe, tank, container, wire, |
| **AFL** | **Resources**  
Shirt machine clip on IWB  
Picture of shirt machine in books x33 in colour below |

| 4 | Look at causal connectives on notebook file. Can we use them in pairs? Display good examples.  
Model how to talk through my diagram from last lesson, explaining the process in 7 parts - make notes in the 7 boxes on the flow chart.  
Similar ability pairs to do this and make notes - ask for pairs to demonstrate their talk (using causal connectives on display). MS with Vern and Stuart - encourage use of connectives on IWB. Model if necessary.  
Teacher to model writing notes into prose. Independent writing. |
| **WALT:** to use causal connectives to explain how something works | **Share some examples of independent writing and evaluate as a class.**  
**Can children see what is good and bad about their work?** |
| **AFL** | **Resources**  
Notebook  
Flow chart pro forma x 33 below as A4  
33 as A3 also |

| 5 | Finish explanation writing.  
Continue to add to the reading layout display - focus on layout part of plan (arrows, pictures, boxes). Add to display then children should copy into revision books.  
Show ‘how honey is made’ explanation. Use as a reading focus. Then ask AF4 questions - What is the purpose of the arrows? Why is |
| **WALT:** use understanding of text layout to answer and ask questions | **Challenge more able children to ask questions of the class.** |
| **AFL** | **Resources**  
‘how honey is made’ explanation x 15 in colour |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Easter week</th>
<th>In revision books list spellings from each rule???</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the writing presented in boxes?</td>
<td>Mon - 40 mins, go through homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is nectar written in bold?</td>
<td>Revision in books of discussions then instructions then recounts then descriptive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of the pictures?</td>
<td>Model it first on flipchart for children to copy into revision books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask further questions with children not using their revision books or the display. Can children ask similar questions to do with the layout?</td>
<td>Copy for absent children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon pm 30 mins - go through pink and green, children to make improvements and add a glossary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOOSTER TASK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue am 1hr 30 - in revision books, write up explanation revision page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show soccamatic clip from Wallace and gromit. Children to write explanation - give them picture and plan to use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed am 1 hr - begin reading display based on layout. Add to wall for children to copy section in revision books. Use 'how is honey made' to ask questions (low ability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share homework - reading task with layout questions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learn genre features - will be tested;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>websites to visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In revision books list spellings from each rule???:**

- Why is nectar written in bold?
- What is the purpose of the pictures?
- Ask further questions with children not using their revision books or the display. Can children ask similar questions to do with the layout?
Appendix 13. Provision map, Eagle Primary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Continued support 1-2 week</th>
<th>Teacher VI = supporting with</th>
<th>PT support = supporting with</th>
<th>OT support = supporting with</th>
<th>OT support arm = supporting with</th>
<th>OT support arm = supporting with</th>
<th>SALT need to support arm</th>
<th>Social communication after half term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP (management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT (management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where 3 maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Nth TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medico-Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema Support Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Motor Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/P (Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Need Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 Spring to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over slurred speech</td>
<td>Check with SALT to monitor behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attendance at SALT meeting</td>
<td>Need to see SALT Nurse due to lack of attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good general knowledge</td>
<td>Need to monitor literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in maths and IT</td>
<td>Need to monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES REGISTER
### SEPTEMBER 2010

### COGNITION AND LEARNING NEEDS
- Specific Learning Difficulty (SpLD)
- Moderate Learning Difficulty (MLD)
- Severe Learning Difficulty (SLD)
- Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulty (PMLD)

### BEHAVIOUR, EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS
- Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulty (BESD)

### COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION NEEDS (CIN)
- Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN)
- Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD)

### SENSORY AND/OR PHYSICAL NEEDS
- Visual Impairment (VI)
- Hearing Impairment (HI)
- Multi-Sensory Impairment (MSI)
- Physical Disability (PD)

### Abbreviations
- LSC – LEARNING SUPPORT CENTRE
- CAU – CURRICULUM ACCESS UNIT
- IBP – INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR PLAN
- IEP – INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN
- CI – CORE INTERVENTION
- RR – READING RECOVERY
- AM – ANGER MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Pupils</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Action</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Action Plus</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statemented</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588 pupils on roll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN percentage in school</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>D.O.B.</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13/07/1998</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29/10/1998</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21/02/1999</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24/02/1999</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>07/11/1998</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08/03/1999</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>07/11/1996</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27/11/1997</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23/08/1999</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29/07/1999</td>
<td>Next term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>D.O.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>03/03/1999</td>
<td>Autumn 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11/12/1995</td>
<td>Spring 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>08/10/1998</td>
<td>Autumn 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22/03/1997</td>
<td>Spring 1 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11/07/1996</td>
<td>Spring 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27/03/1999</td>
<td>Autumn 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>D.O.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18/06/1995</td>
<td>Spring 2 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>07/05/1998</td>
<td>Summer 1 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25/01/1996</td>
<td>Spring 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13/01/1998</td>
<td>Summer 1 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>06/12/1995</td>
<td>Spring 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>09/12/1998</td>
<td>Autumn 2 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17/03/1996</td>
<td>Spring 2 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 15.

#### Summary of schools' information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Education</th>
<th>Eagle Primary School</th>
<th>Erna High School</th>
<th>Dell High School</th>
<th>Elephant High School</th>
<th>Eucalyptus Primary School</th>
<th>Elderberry RC High School</th>
<th>Ethinaeas RC College</th>
<th>Em Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Establishment</td>
<td>Voluntary Controlled</td>
<td>Academy Converters</td>
<td>Voluntary Aided</td>
<td>Community School</td>
<td>Voluntary Aided</td>
<td>Voluntary Aided</td>
<td>Voluntary Aided</td>
<td>Academy Sponsor Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Character</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Capacity</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Children</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Pupils Receiving FSM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Classes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Priority</td>
<td>PDD - Physical Disability</td>
<td>VI - Visual Impairment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HI - Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Business and Enterprise Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Emu</td>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>Eel</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>Echinacea</td>
<td>Elderberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability setting</td>
<td>Ability setting</td>
<td>Personalising learning</td>
<td>Ability setting</td>
<td>Phonics intervention program</td>
<td>Ability based classes</td>
<td>(structure behaviour targets, structure literacy tasks,</td>
<td>TA support in class (individual or for group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA support (in and out of class)</td>
<td>TA support (in and out of classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TA support (in and out of classroom)</td>
<td>Maths interventions</td>
<td>TA support in class (individual or for group)</td>
<td>Withdrawal: Intervention groups in English in a separated room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Out of class interventions:</td>
<td>Maths intervention group (certificate when acquire specific knowledge e.g. talk about feelings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It:</td>
<td>literacy skills/support Phonics</td>
<td>Social emotional intervention group (self-confidence, self-esteem, social abilities)</td>
<td>1:1 tuition, which we used for the SATs, teachers would have once a week for an hour after school, other in literacy or numeracy</td>
<td>Right to read intervention (dyslexia)</td>
<td>Homework support</td>
<td>Help organising/diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home learning book</td>
<td>Social circle</td>
<td>10:1:1 session in literacy, numeracy over a half-term – certificate at the end</td>
<td>Dual placements with special needs schools (e.g. 2 days/week in special school 3 days in mainstream school)</td>
<td>Social emotional intervention group (self-confidence, self-esteem, social abilities)</td>
<td>Spellings competitions</td>
<td>Time in the LSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet place when needed (move by whom?)</td>
<td>Social circle</td>
<td>Social circle</td>
<td>Social circle</td>
<td>Social circle</td>
<td>Targeted Readers</td>
<td>Targeted Readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Assembly group</td>
<td>Communication group</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Communication group</td>
<td>Time Talk</td>
<td>Time Talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly group</td>
<td>Communication group</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Communication group</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Every Child a Counter</td>
<td>Every Child a Counter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior learning session</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Prior learning session</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Prior learning session</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 16.

Responses to diversity in the 8 English schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home/school behaviour book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homework club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwei club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave class early for travelling safely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take mini laptop home on Friday to practice typing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite mum into sessions (reading/phonics) so learning can be reinforced at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Straton parenting course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor: chef, three different foods, behaviour organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 main areas: behaviour, learning, underachievement, medical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment service support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil referral unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Youth Offending Team (YOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials used: e.g. adapted equipment, page filter and spellchecked for dyslexic student, laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access arrangements for exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with X referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring: Reading and writing, Verbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ability concerns: Emotional wellbeing, Relationship with peers, Attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 17. Year 1/ Year 2 pupil described by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>Emotional problem? Lives in children’s home, refuses to work, aggressive, challenging behaviour, 3/2008?</td>
<td>Had lots of difficulties, has been assessed and accepted under 3/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helio</td>
<td>Asperger, attention problem, had doctor’s statement, waiting for school decision re special education support, 3/2008?</td>
<td>Asperger, attention problem, still waiting for special ed. support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foreigner, from Romania little/ no Portuguese, below class average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I was planning to do a recovery plan but I must check if it is legal, because of the issue of not penalising him for his language’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel</td>
<td>Difficult family life, low self-esteem, difficulties in reading and writing, behaviour problems, taller than peers, attention problems, lack of motivation</td>
<td>difficulties in numeracy, problematic family, avoids work, little effort, gives up, 50/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Single mum (illiterate and unemployed), immature, difficulties in reading and writing</td>
<td>Little/ no progress, cannot read/ write; not just immature, poor concentration, wants to play, 50/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipe</td>
<td>Lack of confidence, difficulties in understanding what reads</td>
<td>Difficulties in reasoning, mental maths, anxious, fear of new things, makes an effort, family interested/ helps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Speech difficulties, difficult family life/ parents divorced, spelling difficulties (writes as speaks)</td>
<td>Dysphonic often, difficulties spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 18. Year 4/ Year 5 pupil described by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitor</td>
<td>Severe dyslexia, taking medication for attention, supported by parents</td>
<td>Dyslexia, dysgraphia, quiet, lethargic, shy, well behaved, SEN, generous, does same as peers because class average is very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Dyslexia, difficulties in maths, attention problem, emotionally needy</td>
<td>Does not want to work in class, aggressive, SEN, 3/2008, difficulties in learning, lack of interest in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Difficulties in maths, writing and spelling, interested, difficulty to focus</td>
<td>Cannot copy, cannot cope with class, gaps in knowledge, too quiet, family issues, lack of attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>Difficulties in Portuguese, impacts the rest, slow, emotional instability, attention problems</td>
<td>Lack of attention and will to learn, cannot follow reading, cannot read/ write/ spell, immature, does not care about anything, supportive parents – extra tuition after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Little participation, no opinion, lack of initiative, some difficulties in maths</td>
<td>Impeccable, hard-working, participative, quiet, tidy, pays attention, interested and supportive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catarina</td>
<td>Similar to Maria but progressing, more participative</td>
<td>Problems with grammar, negative grade, lazy, quiet, doesn’t worry/ care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madalena</td>
<td>Doesn’t like maths, has great potential, good in literacy</td>
<td>No problems/ difficulties, chatty, immature, young committed parents,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>Wasn’t born with disability, social/ emotional problem, dysfunctional family (on benefits, all sleep together), steals, has SEN and IEP, below average in cognition, always late</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 19. IEP, Vitor, Year 4, Peacock 1st cycle school

ANO LECTIVO 2009/10

PROGRAMA EDUCATIVO INDIVIDUAL

Decreto-lei N.º 3/2008

Estabelecimento de Ensino: [redacted]

 Nome: [redacted]  
 Data de Nascimento: 25.10.2000

Nível de Educação ou Ensino: 1CEB  
Ano de Escolaridade: 4.º  
Turma: D

Morada: [redacted]

Código Postal: [redacted]  
Localidade: [redacted]  
Telefone: [redacted]

Encarregado de Educação: [redacted]

Docente Responsável pelo Grupo/Turma: Sónia [redacted]

Docente de Educação Especial: Guida [redacted]
1. História Escolar e Pessoal

Resumo da história escolar:

O [redacted] é o primeiro de uma fratria de 2 (irmão com 5 anos).

Iniciou o Jardim de Infância com cerca de 3 anos de idade, sem dificuldades de adaptação, porém já revelara dificuldades de concentração, desinteresse, descoordenação motora e dificuldades na motricidade fina e grosseira.

Frequenta a Escola [redacted] desde o 2.º ano de escolaridade.

Desde o início do 1.º CEB que o [redacted] revela dificuldades na leitura e na escrita (ortografia e caligrafia) e dificuldades na focalização e manutenção da atenção.

Atualmente frequenta o 4.º ano de escolaridade.

Outros antecedentes relevantes:

Antecedentes familiares compatíveis com Perturbação de Leitura e de Escrita.

Fez avaliação psicológica na Clínica de Dislexia, Dra. Paula [redacted]

2. Perfil de Funcionalidade

(Funções do corpo, Actividade e participação e Factores ambientais)

Revela problemáticas grandes em:

Funções da atenção, funções mentais específicas de concentração num estímulo externo ou numa experiência interna pelo período de tempo necessário;

Funções mentais da linguagem (funções mentais específicas de reconhecimento e utilização de sinais, símbolos e outros componentes de uma linguagem).

Revela limitações médias em:

Pensar para formular e ordenar ideias e conceitos;

Revela limitações altas em:

Concentrar a atenção em estímulos específicos durante a realização das actividades, desligando-se de outros estímulos que distraem;

Ler, nomeadamente em actividades envolvidas na compreensão e interpretação de textos escritos com o objectivo de adquirir conhecimentos gerais ou informações específicas;

Escrever, para utilizar ou compor símbolos para transmitir informações;

Calcular, para aplicar princípios matemáticos básicos;

Resolver problemas encontrando soluções para os mesmos;

Tomar decisões para fazer uma escolha entre opções, implementar a opção escolhida e avaliar os
efeitos;

**Levar a cabo uma tarefa única**, tendo em consideração: iniciar a tarefa, organizar o tempo, o espaço e os materiais;

**Escrever mensagens**, produzir mensagens com significado literal e implícito transmitidas através da linguagem escrita, como por exemplo, escrever uma carta a um amigo.

**Constituem Facilitadores elevados:**

**Família próxima**, tendo em conta o apoio ao estudo e à organização de materiais, bem como a nível de outras intervenções: protecção e assistência;

**Amigos**, uma vez que fomentam a integração no grupo/turma e mantêm uma relação de companheirismo, valores que têm contribuído para o desenvolvimento da auto-confiança e da sua identidade;

**Conhecidos, pares, colegas, vizinhos e membros da comunidade**, indivíduos com relações de familiaridade entre si, tais como, conhecidos, pares, colegas, vizinhos, e membros da comunidade em situações relacionadas com o trabalho, escola, tempos livres, ou outros aspectos da vida;

**Outros profissionais**, a professora da turma e a professora de ensino especial mostram-se disponíveis no que se refere ao acompanhamento do aluno, adoptando metodologias e estratégias adaptadas às situações de ensino/aprendizagem (pedagogia diferenciada... ), e ao mesmo tempo regulando os seus comportamentos no sentido de os adequar ao diferentes contextos/ambientes;

**Profissionais de saúde**, tendo em consideração o acompanhamento realizado através das consultas;

**Serviços, sistemas e políticas** (serviços de educação), que pela forma ajustada e continuada têm vindo a fomentar a convergência de atitudes, no âmbito das estratégias e das metodologias, com vista ao desenvolvimento das competências na vertente dos diferentes saberes (ser/estar/fazer).

3. **Adequações no Processo de ensino Aprendizagem**

**Medidas Educativas a Implementar:**

- **Artigo 17º Apoio pedagógico personalizado – alínneas d)**

Alinea d) — reforço e desenvolvimento de competências específicas.

- **Artigo 19º Adequações no processo de matrícula**

Número 1 — beneficia de condições especiais de matrícula, podendo nos termos do presente Decreto - Lei, frequentar a escola, independentemente da sua área de residência.
• **Artigo 20º Adequações no processo de avaliação**

A avaliação dos progressos do aluno será feita de forma contínua, ao longo do ano lectivo, por todos os intervenientes no processo de ensino-aprendizagem. A informação da avaliação será traduzida em linguagem qualitativa. Quanto aos conteúdos previstos nas diferentes áreas curriculares, propõe-se a adopção das adequações no processo de avaliação, a saber:

- Privilegiar a avaliação de processos relativamente à avaliação de conteúdos;
- Utilizar instrumentos de trabalho e diferenciados e adequados às competências específicas definidas no âmbito das diferentes áreas;
- Recorrer à avaliação predominantemente assistida pelo professor;
- Adequar o tempo da avaliação às características do aluno (sendo necessário, recorrer a mais tempo para concluir a tarefa/actividade ou permitir que o aluno a realize/conclua com a ajuda do professor de apoio);
- Privilegiar as questões que implicam respostas curtas e directas;
- Utilizar um vocabulário simples de forma a garantir a compreensão dos textos e das fichas.

4. **Plano Individual de Transição**

(Sempre que se justifique a elaboração de um PIT, este deve ser anexado).

5. **Responsáveis pelas respostas educativas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identificação dos intervenientes</th>
<th>Funções desempenhadas</th>
<th>Horário</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ex: Nome)</td>
<td>(Ex: Prof, APP/Disciplina)</td>
<td>(Ex: Dia e hora)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nota:** De acordo com horário em anexo os responsáveis pelas respostas educativas são todos os intervenientes directos.

6. **Implementação e Avaliação do PEI**

**Início da implementação do PEI:** Janeiro de 2009

**Avaliação do PEI:** Com base na análise dos instrumentos de avaliação e/ou sempre que se justifique, na presença dos professores e técnicos envolvidos, o PEI será revisto a qualquer momento, em reuniões de avaliação sumativa ou em reuniões especialmente convocadas para o
### IDENTIFICAÇÃO DA ESCOLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escola/Domicilio:</th>
<th>Ano Escolar:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed./Prof. do Ensino Regular:</th>
<th>Quem efectuou a referenciação:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Sónia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IDENTIFICAÇÃO DO ALUNO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome:</th>
<th>Data de Nascimento:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.10.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morada:</th>
<th>Filiação:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encarregado de Educação:</th>
<th>Morada:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a mesma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERFIL DE FUNCIONALIDADE

#### Síntese Descritiva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funções do Corpo</th>
<th>Actividade e Participação</th>
<th>Factores Ambientais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b140.3 – Funções da atenção</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b167.3 – Funções mentais da linguagem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d160.3 – Concentrar a atenção</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d163.2 - Pensar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d166.3 - Ler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d170.3 – Escrever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d172.3 - Calcular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d175.3 – Resolver problemas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d177.3 - Tomar decisões</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d210.3 – Levar a cabo uma tarefa única</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d345.3 – Escrever mensagens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e310+3 – Família próxima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e320+3 - Amigos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e325+3 – Conhecidos, pares, colegas, vizinhos e membros da comunidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e355+3 – Profissionais de saúde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. TOMADA DE DECISÃO

Necessidade de Educação Especial (assinale com uma cruz)

a) Não se confirma a necessidade de intervenção especializada em Educação Especial
   • Assinale os apoios disponibilizados pela escola que melhor se adequam à sua especificidade

Despacho Normativo 50/2005
Despacho Normativo 1/2006

Outros:

b) Confirma-se a necessidade de intervenção especializada em Educação Especial
   • Fundamente a intervenção especializada de Educação Especial (medidas e recursos):

Artigo 17º – Apoio pedagógico personalizado

a) Reforço das estratégias utilizadas no grupo ou turma aos níveis
d da organização, do espaço e das actividades
b) Estímulo e reforço das competências e aptidões envolvidas na aprendizagem
c) Antecipação e reforço da aprendizagem de conteúdos leccionados
   no seio do grupo turma
d) Reforço e desenvolvimento de competências específicas

Artigo 18º – Adequações curriculares individuais
Artigo 19º – Adequações no processo de matrícula
Artigo 20º – Adequações no processo de avaliação
Artigo 21º – Currículo específico individual
Artigo 22º – Tecnologias de apoio
### Aluno:
**Data:** Janeiro 2009

**CHECKLIST**

#### Funções do Corpo

**Nota:** Assinale com uma cruz (X), à frente de cada categoria, o valor que considera mais adequado à situação de acordo com os seguintes qualificadores:

- 0 - Nenhuma deficiência;
- 1 - Deficiência ligeira;
- 2 - Deficiência moderada;
- 3 - Deficiência grave;
- 4 - Deficiência completa;
- 5 - Não especificada;
- 6 - Não aplicável

**Capítulo 1 – Funções Mentais**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Funções Mentais Globais)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b110 Funções da consciência</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b114 Funções da orientação no espaço e no tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b117 Funções intelectuais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b122 Funções psicosociais globais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b125 Funções intrapessoais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b128 Funções de temperamento e da personalidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b134 Funções do sono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Funções Mentais Específicas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b140 Funções da atenção</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b144 Funções da memória</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b147 Funções psicomotoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b152 Funções emocionais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b156 Funções da percepção</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b163 Funções cognitivas básicas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b164 Funções cognitivas de nível superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b167 Funções mentais da linguagem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b172 Funções do cálculo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capítulo 2 – Funções sensoriais e dor**

| b210 Funções da visão | |
| b215 Funções dos anexos do olho | |
| b230 Funções auditivas | |
| b235 Funções vestibulares | |
| b250 Função gustativa | |
| b255 Função olfativa | |
| b260 Função proprioceptiva | |
| b265 Função táctil | |
| b280 Sensação de dor | |

**Capítulo 3 – Funções da voz e da fala**

| b310 Funções da voz | |
| b320 Funções de articulação | |
| b330 Funções da fluência e do ritmo da fala | |

**Capítulos 4 – Funções do aparelho cardiovascular, dos sistemas hematólégico e imunológico e do aparelho respiratório**

<p>| b410 Funções cardíacas | |
| b420 Funções da pressão arterial | |
| b429 Funções cardiovasculares, não especificadas | |
| b430 Funções do sistema hematólégico | |
| b435 Funções do sistema imunológico | |
| b440 Funções da respiração | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 5 – Funções do aparelho digestivo e dos sistemas metabólicos e endócrino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b515   Funções digestivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b525   Funções de defecção</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b530   Funções de manutenção do peso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b555   Funções das glândulas endócrinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b560   Funções de manutenção do crescimento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capítulo 6 – Funções geniturinárias e reprodutivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b620   Funções miccionais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 7 – Funções neuromusculoesqueléticas e funções relacionadas com o movimento</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b710   Funções relacionadas com a mobilidade das articulações</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b715   Estabilidade das funções das articulações</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b730   Funções relacionadas com a força muscular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b735   Funções relacionadas com o tônus muscular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b740   Funções relacionadas com a resistência muscular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b750   Funções relacionadas com reflexos motores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b755   Funções relacionadas com reações motoras involuntárias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b760   Funções relacionadas com o controle do movimento voluntário</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b765   Funções relacionadas com o controle do movimento involuntário</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b770   Funções relacionadas com o padrão de marcha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b780   Funções relacionadas com o músculos e funções do movimento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outras funções corporais a considerar:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actividade e Participação

**Nota:** Assinale com uma cruz (X), à frente de cada categoria, o valor que considera mais adequado à situação ao nível do desempenho do que o indivíduo faz no ambiente de vida habitual, de acordo com as seguintes qualificadoras:

- 0- Nenhuma dificuldade;
- 1- Dificuldade ligeira;
- 2- Dificuldade moderada;
- 3- Dificuldade grave;
- 4- Dificuldade completa;
- 5- Não especificada;
- 6- Não aplicável.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 1 – Aprendizagem e Aplicação de Conhecimentos</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d110 Observer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d115 Ouvir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d130 Imitar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d131 Aprendizagem através de acções/manipulação de objectos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d132 Aquisição de informação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d133 Aquisição da linguagem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d134 Desenvolvimento da linguagem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d137 Aquisição de conceitos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d140 Aprender a ler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d145 Aprender a escrever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d150 Aprender a calcular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d155 Adquirir competências</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d160 Concentrar a atenção</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d161 Diricionar a atenção</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d163 Pescar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d166 Ler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d170 Escrever</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d172 Calcular</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d175 Resolver problemas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d177 Tomar decisões</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 2 – Tarefas e exigências gerais</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d210 Levar a cabo uma tarefa única</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d220 Levar a cabo tarefas múltiplas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d230 Levar a cabo a rotina diária</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d250 Controlar o seu próprio comportimento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 3 – Comunicação</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d310 Comunicar e receber mensagens orais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d315 Comunicar e receber mensagens não verbais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d325 Comunicar e receber mensagens escritas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d330 Falar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d331 Pré - conversação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d332 Cantar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d335 Produzir mensagens não verbais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d340 Produzir mensagens na linguagem formal dos sinais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d345 Escrever mensagens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d350 Conversação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d355 Discussão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d360 Utilização de dispositivos e de técnicas de comunicação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 4 – Mobilidade</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d410 Mudar as posições básicas do corpo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d415 Manter a posição do corpo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d420 Auto-transferências</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d430 Levantar e transportar objectos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d435 Mover objectos com os membros inferiores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d440 Actividades de motricidade fina da mão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d445 Utilização da mão e do braço</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d446 Utilização do pé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d450 Andar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capítulo 5 – Auto-cuidados</td>
<td></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>d510 Lavar-se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d520 Cuidar de partes do corpo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d530 Higiene pessoal relacionada com as excreções</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d540 Vestir-se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d550 Comer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d560 Beber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d571 Cuidar da própria segurança</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 6 – Vida doméstica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d620 Adquirir bens e serviços</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d630 Preparar refeições</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d640 Realizar o trabalho doméstico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d650 Cuidar dos objectos domésticos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 7 – Interacções e relacionamentos interpessoais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d710 Interacções interpessoais básicas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d720 Interacções interpessoais complexas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d730 Relacionamento com estranhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d740 Relacionamento formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d750 Relacionamentos sociais informais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 8 – Áreas principais da vida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d815 Educação pré-escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d816 Vida pré-escolar e actividades relacionadas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d820 Educação escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d825 Formação profissional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d835 Vida escolar e actividades relacionadas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d880 Envolvimento nas brincadeiras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 9 – Vida comunitária, social e cívica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d910 Vida comunitária</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d920 Recreação e lazer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outros aspectos da Actividade e Participação a considerar
### Factores Ambientais

**Nota:** Podem ser tidos em consideração todas as categorias ou apenas aquelas que se considerarem mais pertinentes em função da condição específica da criança/adolescência. As diferentes categorias podem ser consideradas enquanto barreiras ou facilitadores. Assinale, para cada categoria, com (x) se a está a considerar como barreira ou com (+) se a está a considerar como facilitador. Assinale com uma cruz (X), à frente de cada categoria, o valor que considera mais adequado à situação, de acordo com os seguintes qualiﬁadores:
- **0**: Nenhum facilitador/barreira
- **1**: Facilitador/barreira ligeiro
- **2**: Facilitador/barreira moderado
- **3**: Facilitador/barreira grave
- **4**: Não especificado
- **5**: Não aplicável

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 1 – Produtos e Tecnologia</th>
<th>Barreira ou Facilitador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e110 Para consumo pessoal (alimentos, medicamentos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e115 Para uso pessoal na vida diária</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e120 Para facilitar a mobilidade e o transporte pessoal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e125 Para a comunicação</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e130 Para a educação</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e135 Para o trabalho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e140 Para a cultura, a recreação e o desporto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e150 Arquitectura, construção e acabamentos de prédios de utilização pública</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e155 Arquitectura, construção e acabamentos de prédios para uso privado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capítulo 2 – Ambiente Natural e Mudanças Ambientais feitas pelo Homem |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| e225 Clima |                       |
| e240 Luz |                       |
| e250 Som |                       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 3 – Apoio e Relacionamentos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e310 Família próxima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e320 Amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e325 Conhecidos, pares, colegas, vizinhos e membros da comunidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e330 Pessoas em posição de autoridade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e340 Prestadores de cuidados pessoais e assistentes pessoais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e350 Outros profissionais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 4 – Atitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e400 Atitudes individuais dos membros da família próxima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e410 Atitudes individuais dos amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e425 Atitudes individuais de conhecidos, pares, colegas e membros da comunidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e440 Atitudes individuais de prestadores de cuidados pessoais e assistentes pessoais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e450 Atitudes individuais de profissionais de saúde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e455 Normas, práticas e ideologias sociais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capítulo 5 – Serviços, Sistemas e Políticas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e515 Relacionados com a arquitectura e a construção</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e540 Relacionados com os transportes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e570 Relacionados com a segurança social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e575 Relacionados com o apoio social geral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e580 Relacionados com a saúde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e590 Relacionados com o trabalho e o emprego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e595 Relacionados com o sistema político</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outros factores ambientais a considerar**

| e355 Profissionais de saúde | +  X |
| e585 Serviços, sistemas e políticas | +  X |
Appendix 22.   IEP, Vitor, Year 5, Pheasant School

PROGRAMA EDUCATIVO INDIVIDUAL
(Decreto-Lei 3/2008 de 7 de Janeiro)

ANO LECTIVO 2010/2011

Nome: ___________________________ Idade: 10 Anos

Data de Nascimento: 25 / 10 / 2000

Morada: ___________________________

Nível de Educação ou Ensino: 2º Ciclo do Ensino Básico

Ano de Escolaridade: 5º     Turma: C

Encarregado de Educação: ___________________________

Grau de Parentesco: X Mãe  □ Pai  □ Outro ___________________________
HISTÓRIA ESCOLAR E PESSOAL

RESUMO DA HISTÓRIA ESCOLAR

O [ ] vive com os pais e um irmão mais novo.
Nasceu com 27 semanas e com baixo peso.

Frequentou o Jardim de Infância a partir dos 3 anos de idade, contudo a sua assiduidade foi muito irregular pois, com frequência estava doente.

No externato [******] frequentou o pré-escolar e no ano lectivo 2006/2007 iniciou o 1º Ciclo do Ensino Básico, com 6 anos de idade. Na altura ofereceu resistência à escola, notando-se alguma tristeza, imaturidade e baixa auto-estima. Revelou desinteresse, dificuldades de concentração e a nível da motricidade fina.

No ano lectivo 2007/2008 iniciou o 2º ano na escola [******] onde permaneceu até à conclusão do 1º Ciclo. A adaptação à escola foi mais fácil, contudo persistiram as grandes dificuldades na leitura, escrita (ortografia e caligrafia), cálculo e em focalizar e manter a atenção às tarefas. No 3º ano foi elaborado um Plano de Recuperação, implementado até final desse ano lectivo. Devido às dificuldades escolares e apesar da ajuda constante da mãe, foi encaminhado pela médica pediatra para consulta de neuropediatria e para avaliação psicológica.

Desde o 4º ano que o [ ] é seguido em neuropediatria pelo Dr. [******]. Nesse ano de escolaridade foi medicado com “Concerta” para o défice de atenção.

Também no início do 4º ano de escolaridade (Outubro de 2009) foi avaliado na Clínica da [******] pela Drª P[******]. Segundo relatório de Avaliação Cognitiva e Psicoeducacional o [ ] apresenta um funcionamento cognitivo geral de nível médio. Contudo, as suas dificuldades escolares são justificadas pela presença de perturbação de atenção e da escrita – Síndrome de Dislexia e Disortografia. Em comorbilidade, apresenta dificuldades de focalização e manutenção da atenção. Durante o 4º ano de escolaridade o [ ] foi acompanhado semanalmente em reeducação da dislexia pela psicóloga educacional Drª [******]

Na escola, foi elaborado um Relatório Técnico-Pedagógico e o [ ] foi integrado ao abrigo do Decreto-Lei 3/2008 passando a usufruir das seguintes Medidas Educativas: Apoio Pedagógico Personalizado (incluindo o reforço e desenvolvimento de competências específicas), Adequações no Processo de Avaliação e Adequações no Processo de Matrícula (frequência de escola independentemente da sua área de residência). Não obstante continuar a ser um aluno com limitações a nível da actividade e participação, a sua evolução foi positiva, mostrando maior capacidade para se organizar e melhorando o seu auto conceito de estudante e de sentido de responsabilidade.

No ano lectivo 2010/2011 iniciou o 2º Ciclo do Ensino Básico na Escola Básica e Secundária (******)

OUTROS ANTECEDENTES RELEVANTES

O [ ] durante o 4º ano, na escola, teve apoio directo individualizado com docente de educação especial.
PERFIL DE FUNCIONALIDADE DO ALUNO POR REFERÊNCIA À CIF-CJ

INDICADORES DE FUNCIONALIDADE E NÍVEL DE AQUISIÇÕES E DIFICULDADES

ACTIVIDADE E PARTICIPAÇÃO:

O  apresenta pouca autonomia e um ritmo de trabalho muito lento.
As grandes dificuldades de concentração numa tarefa (alheamento) têm sido uma barreira para o processo ensino-aprendizagem e consequente rendimento escolar.
Na escrita, notam-se dificuldades significativas em organizar as ideias, quando é pedido algum desenvolvimento e escreve com muitos erros ortográficos.
Também as dificuldades a nível da leitura (lentidão e inúmeras incorreções) têm influência na compreensão/interpretação dos textos.
Em suma, o  apresenta dificuldades graves em concentrar a atenção, ler/escrever, organizar as ideias e no cálculo; apresenta dificuldades moderadas em levar a cabo uma tarefa única e em tomar decisões, devido à sua pouca autonomia.

FUNÇÕES E ESTRUTURAS DO CORPO:

Segundo relatório de Avaliação Cognitiva e Psicoeducacional o  apresenta um funcionamento cognitivo geral de nível médio. Contudo, as suas dificuldades escolares são justificadas pela presença de perturbação da leitura e da escrita – Síndrome de Dislexia e Disortografia. Paralelamente apresenta dificuldades de focalização e manutenção da atenção.
A linguagem expressiva não apresenta perturbações significativas. Contudo a velocidade de leitura apresenta-se inferior à esperada e com inúmeras imprecisões (inversões, substituições, omissões e adições) o que tem repercussões na compreensão do texto lido. Na escrita emite muitos erros ortográficos. O seu ritmo de trabalho é muito lento.
Todas estas dificuldades são visíveis na produção do texto escrito, resultando numa exposição confusa das ideias.
Em suma, o  apresenta limitações graves a nível das funções mentais específicas da linguagem e da atenção que comprometem a sua actividade e participação.

FACTORES AMBIENTAIS QUE FUNCIONAM COMO FACILITADORES OU COMO BARREIRAS À PARTICIPAÇÃO E À APRENDIZAGEM

Os pais valorizam os progressos do  tendo-lhe prestado, ao longo da escolaridade, todo o apoio necessário o que tem constituído um factor facilitador para um desempenho escolar mais ajustado. A mãe tem sido um apoio constante, em casa, na ajuda ao estudo.
Os professores apresentam-se disponíveis para utilizarem estratégias e medidas que atenuem as dificuldades do aluno, valorizando o seu esforço e progressos e contribuindo deste modo, para uma maior auto-estima.
O apoio psicopedagógico e clínico prestado, têm sido um facilitador importante, contribuindo para minorar as limitações na actividade e participação em contexto escolar (não obstante, neste momento, o [ REDACTADO ] não estar a tomar medicação para o défice de atenção, por indicação clínica).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADEQAÇÕES NO PROCESSO DE ENSINO E DE APRENDIZAGEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MEDIDAS EDUCATIVAS A IMPLEMENTAR  (Artigo 16º, Decreto-Lei 3/2008)

As medidas educativas visam promover a aprendizagem e a participação do aluno com necessidades educativas especiais de carácter permanente.

a) Apoio Pedagógico Personalizado
- Língua Portuguesa, Inglês e Matemática

Estes apoios visam:
- estimular e reforçar as competências e aptidões envolvidas na aprendizagem;
- reforçar a aprendizagem de conteúdos leccionados no grupo turma;
- desenvolver a autonomia e melhorar a auto estima do aluno.

A avaliação nestas disciplinas deve contemplar também o desempenho do [ REDACTADO ] nos apoios.

d) Adequadões no Processo de Avaliação

Alteração do tipo de prova: testes adaptados à problemática do [ REDACTADO ]
- questões formuladas com linguagem simples de modo a ser inteligível para o aluno;
- utilizar respostas de escolha múltipla (particularmente importante no Inglês);
- privilegiar questões que impliquem respostas curtas e directas;
- questões de desenvolvimento: sugerir tópicos principais, para orientação do aluno;
- evitar textos longos;
- nos textos utilizar margens grandes, para possibilitar linhas menos longas;
- utilizar letra Arial 12 e espaçamento 1,5 entre linhas;
- suprimir uma ou outra questão e/ou formulá-la de modo a minimizar o tempo de descodificação da leitura e o da produção escrita (se tal se considerar pertinente).

Na correção de testes ou trabalhos escritos, não penalizar pelos erros ortográficos (embora devam ser sempre corrigidos), nem pela exposição dos conteúdos (construção frásica) por vezes pouco clara.

Alteração das condições de avaliação:
- privilegiar a oralidade;
- pedir ao aluno a elaboração de pequenos resumos de conteúdos leccionados e que servam de preparação para os testes (como TPC).

OUTRAS INFORMAÇÕES  (Tipo de terapia que o aluno beneficie)

Presentemente, segundo indicação do neuropediatria, o [ REDACTADO ] não está a tomar medicação para o défice de atenção.
CONTEÚDOS, OBJECTIVOS/COMPETÊNCIAS, ESTRATÉGIAS E RECURSOS HUMANOS E MATERIAIS

O aluno cumpre o currículo comum das várias disciplinas curriculares e não curriculares

NÍVEL DE PARTICIPAÇÃO NAS ACTIVIDADES EDUCATIVAS DA ESCOLA

O [nome] participa em todas as actividades propostas para o grupo turma.

DISTRIBUIÇÃO HORÁRIA DAS DIFERENTES ACTIVIDADES PREVISTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horas</th>
<th>2ª Feira</th>
<th>3ª Feira</th>
<th>4ª Feira</th>
<th>5ª Feira</th>
<th>6ª Feira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PLANO INDIVIDUAL DE TRANSIÇÃO

Existe Plano Individual de Transição (PIT) em anexo [□]

Não existe Plano Individual de Transição [X]

RESPONSÁVEIS PELAS RESPOSTAS EDUCATIVAS

Identificação dos Intervenientes

Cláudia [□]
Judite [□]
Alcina [□]
Ana [□]
Helena [□]
Ana [□]/Isabel [□]
Ana Cristina [□]

Funções desempenhadas

D Turma/Prof Ling Port/Área Proj/Est Ac/Form Civ
Prof Inglês
Prof Hist Geog Portugal
Prof Matemática
Prof Ciências Naturais
Prof Ed Física
Prof Ed Visual e Tecnológica
Prof Ed Musical
IMPLEMENTAÇÃO E Avaliação do PEI

INÍCIO DA IMPLEMENTAÇÃO DO PEI

No início do 2º período lectivo.

AVALIAÇÃO DO PEI

A avaliação do PEI decorrerá em tempo útil, sempre que seja necessário rever as medidas estabelecidas e obrigatoriamente nos momentos de classificação, no final de cada período e no final do ano lectivo.

No final do ano lectivo deverá ser elaborado Relatório Final, explicitando a necessidade, ou não, do aluno continuar a beneficiar de adequações no processo de ensino/aprendizagem, propondo-se as alterações necessárias ao Programa Educativo (este relatório será anexado ao PEI).

Programa Educativo Individual Elaborado por:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Assinatura</th>
<th>Função</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciáudia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director de Turma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Ed. Especial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filomena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psicóloga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enc. Educação</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: __/__/__
Medidas Educativas

PLANO DE RECUPERAÇÃO ☒ PLANO DE ACOMPANHAMENTO ☐ PLANO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO

1 – PLANO DE RECUPERAÇÃO / PLANO DE ACOMPANHAMENTO

Áreas disciplinares em que manifestou dificuldades de aprendizagem (sinalize com uma ☒):

Língua Portuguesa ☒; Estudo do Meio ☒; Matemática ☒; Expressões Artísticas e Físico-Motoras ☐

A - Pedagogia diferenciada na sala de aula:

☐ Adaptação das práticas pedagógicas às necessidades do aluno/a:

Especifique: Apoio individualizado; reforço positivo aquando da realização correcta das tarefas/actividades solicitadas; trabalho em tutórias.

☐ Adaptação de instrumentos de avaliação (Fichas de Trabalho/Fichas de Avaliação);

☐ Outras situações: Alargamento dos períodos de tempo necessário para a execução e conclusão das tarefas propostas, de acordo com o ritmo de trabalho e execução do aluno. Desenvolver a auto-estima.

B) Apoio a estratégias de estudo, orientação e aconselhamento do aluno;

☐ Cumprimento das obrigações escolares / acompanhamento escolar por parte do Enc. de Educação (assiduidade; comportamento; realização das tarefas escolares; estudo regular)

☐ Desenvolvimento de técnicas de estudo facilitadoras da aprendizagem (no âmbito do apoio ao estudo);

Especifique: Promover o trabalho a pares (tutórias), com alunos que apresentem bom aproveitamento. Promover estudo/trabalho autónomo e independente através da utilização de ficheiros de Língua Portuguesa e de Matemática.

☐ Outras situações: Apoio individualizado nas aulas de apoio ao estudo, no âmbito das actividades escolares. Apoio Pedagógico e individualizado, com o Professor R , duas vezes por semana.
C) Actividades de compensação em qualquer momento do ano lectivo ou no início de um novo ciclo;

- Aulas de recuperação / Apoio Pedagógico:  
  - 6º Período;
  - Ao longo do ano

  Língua Portuguesa □; Estudo do Meio □; Matemática □; Expressões Artísticas e Físico-Motoras □

- Outras situações:

---

D) Actividades de ensino específico da língua portuguesa para alunos oriundos de países estrangeiros.

- Aulas de recuperação / Apoio Pedagógico:
  - 6º Período;
  - Ao longo do ano

- Outras situações:

---

2 - PLANO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO

A - Pedagogia diferenciada na sala de aula:

- Adaptação das práticas pedagógicas às capacidades do aluno/a:

  Língua Portuguesa □; Estudo do Meio □; Matemática □; Expressões Artísticas e Físico-Motoras □

- Especifique:

---

- Actividades de enriquecimento;

  Especifique:

---

- Outras situações:

---
Appendix 24.  Recovery Plan, Paulo, Year 4, Physalis School

Plano de Recuperação
(Despacho Normativo nº 50 de 2005)

Dados do Aluno

Nome do Aluno: [Redacted]

Escola: [Redacted]
Ano 4.º Turma B N.º 12

Data de Nascimento: 29/10/1999
N.º de Retenções: 1º Ano __ 2º Ano __ 3º Ano __ 4º Ano __

Beneficia de Apoio Educativo: Sim [X] Não __ Quantas horas? 1h 30m

1. Perfil de Aprendizagem do Aluno

1.1. Dificuldades Diagnosticadas: (que deverão estar de acordo com as competências essenciais definidas para o ano de escolaridade em questão)

O [Redacted] é um aluno interessado e participativo, mas com dificuldade em se concentrar nos trabalhos a realizar. Distrai-se com muita com muita facilidade e é pouco organizado, o que compromete o seu desempenho escolar e a realização das tarefas no tempo proposto.

O [Redacted] ainda revela muitas dificuldades, sobretudo na área da Língua Portuguesa, a sua leitura ainda é hesitante e necessita de ajuda para a construção de textos. Redige com muitos erros ortográficos e a sua grafia é pouco cuidada: troca letras nas palavras, omite letras, confunde alguns fonemas.

Na área da matemática ainda necessita de alguma ajuda na interpretação / compreensão de situações problemáticas, bem como na procura de estratégias que facilitem o cálculo mental e a resolução de problemas.

1.2. Aptidões: (que deverão estar de acordo com as competências essenciais definidas para o ano de escolaridade em questão)

O [Redacted] manifesta gosto pela vida escolar e está sempre disponível para colaborar. Gosta de participar em actividades de grupo, comunicar e discutir ideias mas nem sempre respeita normas e regras de convivência.

Na área da Língua Portuguesa deve ler com regularidade para poder melhorar a entoação e expressividade e participar na escrita de textos e em actividades de escrita para poder ultrapassar as dificuldades a nível da ortografia e sequência de ideias.

Na área da matemática deve procurar exprimir as suas dúvidas e dificuldades e desenvolver capacidades para resolver situações problemáticas. Deve, ainda, organizar estratégias criativas face às questões colocadas por um problema. É também necessário desenvolver mecanismos que facilitem o cálculo mental e interiorizar algumas regras e técnicas matemáticas.

Deve melhorar a sua capacidade de atenção e ser mais empenhado. Deve ainda cuidar a apresentação e organização dos seus trabalhos.
2. MODALIDADES

A] MEDIDAS PEDAGÓGICAS TOMADAS PELA ESCOLA

☐ PEDAGOGIA DIFERENCIADA NA SALA DE AULA.

Incentivar a participação nas actividades escolares através de actividades que o coloquem em situações facilitadoras da aprendizagem: leitura de histórias ou textos sugeridos ou por iniciativa própria, organização de listas de palavras, memorizar rimas, escrita de textos livres, acontecimentos, recados, convites, cartas, escrita colaborativa, recoina de adivinhas, lênguas, proverbiões, jogos que promovam a memorização da matemática, participação no problema da semana, comunicar as suas ideias e raciocínios utilizados para efectuar cálculos ou resolver situações problemáticas.

Diversificar estratégias de trabalho (trabalhar a pares...em grupo).

Envolver o aluno na apresentação e explicação de conteúdos programáticos, na área da Matemática, Língua portuguesa e Estudo do Meio.

Apoiar na realização dos trabalhos.

Colocar o aluno em situações de liderança.

Participar em jogos que facilitem a socialização.

Avaliar o seu trabalho e atitudes.

☐ ACTIVIDADES DE COMPENSAÇÃO (TAREFAS DE REFORÇO QUE PROMOVAM AS APRENDIZAGENS NECESSÁRIAS EM CONTEXTOS DIVERSIFICADOS, COMO POR EXEMPLO, APOIO PSICOLÓGICO, TERAPIA DA FALA, TERAPIA OCUPACIONAL, ETC.).

É muito importante que beneficie de apoio educativo com regularidade e que beneficie de apoio psicoterapêutico.

☐ AULAS DE RECUPERAÇÃO.

☐ AULAS DE LÍNGUA PORTUGUESA PARA ALUNOS ESTRANGEIROS.

☐ OUTRAS MODALIDADES.
b) **Medidas Propostas ao Aluno**

- **X** Estar atento na aula.
- **X** Participar na aula.
- **X** Pedir, de imediato, ajuda ao professor, sempre que não compreender algum assunto.
- **X** Estudar diariamente os conteúdos abordados na aula, consultando o caderno diário e o livro.
- **X** Cumprir, em casa, um horário de estudo.
- **X** Fazer todos os trabalhos de casa.
- **X** Respeitar os outros.
- □ Cumprir as regras da sala de aula.
- □ Ser pontual.
- □ Ser assíduo.
- **X** Trazer o material necessário para as aulas.
- □ Outras, ____________

**C) Medidas Propostas ao Encarregado de Educação**

- **X** Zele pelo cumprimento do horário de estudo.
- **X** Atender à realização de trabalhos de casa.
- **X** Ajude a organizar o material de estudo.
- □ Controlar a assiduidade do aluno.
- □ Estimular a pontualidade.
- □ Estimular o aluno para frequentar as aulas de apoio.
- □ Controlar a frequência das aulas de apoio.
- □ Verificar semanalmente a caderneta do aluno para tomar conhecimento de mensagens que lhe são dirigidas.
- **X** Apreciar os sucessos do aluno, estimulando-o.
- □ Outras...

3. **Recursos**

- **X** Professor de apoio educativo
- □ Professor de educação especial
- **X** Plano Inclinado
- **X** Computador
- **X** Software e outros jogos educativos
- **X** Outros: Materiais didáticos de matemática, livros do Plano Nacional de Leitura, fichas de
4. Parcerias Desenvolvidas pelo Professor/Escola/Agrupamento (Riscar o que não se adequa)

☐ Técnico de apoio psicoterapêutico
☐ Terapeuta da Fala
☐ Assistente Social
☐ Centro de Saúde
☐ Comissão para a Protecção de Crianças e Jovens em Risco
☒ Outros: Foi encaminhado para apoio psicoterapêutico, na Clínica da Encamação.

5. Observações

O/Os Professor/es

Data 23/12/20xx

Este plano foi apresentado, de acordo com o ponto 4 do artigo 3º, do Despacho Normativo n.º 50/2005, à Direcção Executiva do Agrupamento em 04/01/2010
Tomei conhecimento
A Direcção Executiva

Data 04/01/2010

Tomei conhecimento
O Encarregado de Educação

Aluno

Data 6/1/20xx

Tomei conhecimento

Data 6/1/20xx
Appendix 25. Recovery/ Follow up/ Development Plan, Generic, Primula 2\textsuperscript{nd}/ 3\textsuperscript{rd} cycle School

O Conselho de Turma, a partir dos resultados da avaliação interna, propôs em \__/__/\ para o aluno \___________\ um:

Plano de Acompanhamento\(\square\) (actualmente no \__\° Ano/Turma \__\°, n\° \__, DT: \__________)\nPlano de Recuperação\(\square\)/ Desenvolvimento\(\square\)

a aplicar no ano lectivo de \__\_/\__, aluno do \__\° (ano/turma), n\° \__, DT: \__________, com os seguintes objectivos:

Levar o aluno a ultrapassar as dificuldades detectadas. \hspace{1cm} Ajudar o aluno a adquirir métodos e hábitos de estudo.
Levar o aluno a modificar a sua atitude/comportamento na escola. \hspace{1cm} Assegurar uma boa relação entre a Escola e o melo familiar.

AVALIAÇÃO: Níveis e avaliação qualitativa nas disciplinas e nas áreas curriculares não disciplinares (NAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinas/NAC</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMRC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>neg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Níveis/Av. Qualitativa-3.\textsuperscript{a} P.</td>
<td>(\bigcirc)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>EMRC</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>neg*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinas/NAC</td>
<td>(\bigcirc)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>EMRC</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>neg*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Níveis/Av. Qualitativa-1.\textsuperscript{a} P.</td>
<td>(\bigcirc)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>EMRC</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>neg*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\ast\) Contar os níveis inferiores a 3 e NS e a Área de Projectos (Não considerar para esta contagem a avaliação atribuída em PA, FC e EMRC.)

Caracterização das necessidades do aluno - Planos de Recuperação ou Acompanhamento

(*) Se for o caso, assinalar com X na 1.\textsuperscript{a} coluna de respectiva disciplina e, na 2.\textsuperscript{a} coluna, colocar \(\checkmark\) se/qual a dificuldade (ver sido superada.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\ast) Principais dificuldades diagnosticadas no aluno: de ordem cognitiva e procedimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compreender/interpretar informações orais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compreender/interpretar informações escritas em diversos suportes (gráficos, esquemas, mapas,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mobilizar conhecimentos básicos necessários à prestação de novos conteúdos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relacionar conteúdos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aplicar conteúdos programáticos a novas situações/realidades e para resolver problemas do quotidiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Utilizar o raciocínio lógico e/ou abstrato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Memorizar ideias e conceitos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expressar-se oralmente com clareza linguística e sequencialidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elaborar enunciados escritos com clareza linguística e sequencialidade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expressar ideias/informações através de outras línguas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dominar técnicas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Desenvolver apontos psicomotoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Realizar as actividades escolares da aula e os TPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Revelar autonomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contar os níveis inferiores a 3 e NS e a Área de Projectos (Não considerar para esta contagem a avaliação atribuída em PA, FC e EMRC.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

341
16. Investigar, selecionar e utilizar informação em trabalhos de projecto
17. Utilizar as novas tecnologias (TIC)
18. ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMIC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>neg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outras dificuldades*²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMIC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>neg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Visuais/ Auditivas/ Perturbações de fala e linguagem/ Motricidade)

Comportamentos sócio-emocionais significativos*³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMIC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>neg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*³ Imitado/ Atuação/ Impulso/ Desobediente/ Desiste facilmente/ Chora facilmente/ Enerva-se facilmente/ Tem acessos de agressividade/ Desajustado em relação aos adultos/ Rejeitado pelos colegas/ Procura ser líder/ Não pede ajuda ao professor/ Demasiado dependente da ajuda do professor/ Só quer trabalhar sozinho/ Só quer trabalhar em grupo)

Caracterização das capacidades excepcionais do aluno – Plano de Desenvolvimento

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da ordem cognitiva e procedural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da ordem atitudinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principais capacidades a desenvolver e/ou resolução de situações problema:
## Intervenientes e Medidas do Plano

### PROFESSORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Áreas curriculares disciplinares e não disciplinares</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMRC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ngr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pedagogia diferenciada na sala de aula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Atividades de compansiação/ensino (fora da sala de aula)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabalhos de casa extra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabalhos de casa adaptados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fichas de trabalho a realizar na Bibl./Sala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequentar Bibl./SE/Clubes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperar em/Desenvolver projetos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alunos com Plano de Acompanhamento:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptações programáticas necessárias nas disciplinas em que o aluno tenha revelado dificuldades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actividades a desenvolver em ESTUDO ACOMPANHADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Apoios educativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topos (Colocar X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprovados pela Direção (Colocar X de transcar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Programa de tutoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugestões de atividades a desenvolver pelo tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nome do tutor aprovado pela Direção</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Atividades de ensino específico da Língua Portuguesa para alunos oriundos de países estrangeiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nome do professor aprovado pela Direção</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plano de assistência (falta ou em risco de abandono escolar): serviços/instituições a contactar...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OUTRAS MEDIDAS

#### SERVIÇOS OU INSTITUIÇÕES A CONTACTAR/ENVOLVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVIÇOS OU INSTITUIÇÕES A CONTACTAR/ENVOLVER</th>
<th>4. Acompanhamento médico e/ou medicamentoso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encaminhamento para Educação Especial</td>
<td>5. Atividades de tempos livres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encaminhamento para SEAE</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encaminhamento para SEAE e comunicação à CPCJ,...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENCARREGADO DE EDUCAÇÃO

É da responsabilidade do encarregado de educação:

1. Incentivar a prática de atitudes correctas
2. Valorizar as aprendizagens escolares
3. Contactar periodicamente o DT e usar/verificar regularmente a cademerta e os cadernos
4. Responsabilizar o seu educando pelo cumprimento das suas obrigações (assiduidade, pontualidade, material, horário de estudo, ...)
5. Controlar a assiduidade
6. Controlar a pontualidade
7. Controlar o material
8. Verificar o cumprimento do horário de estudo estabelecido
9. Verificar/apoiar a feitura dos TPC
10. Incentivar/Controlar a frequência das actividades de recuperação previstas neste Plano
11. Proporcionar um bom ambiente de trabalho/estudo
12. Dialogar com o aluno sobre progressos/sucessos e dificuldades e assinar os testes

### ALUNO

É da responsabilidade do aluno:

1. Cumprir as regras, melhorando nomeadamente o comportamento
2. Estar atento/concentrado, tirando oportunamente as dúvidas
3. Participar activa e organizadamente na realização das tarefas propostas
4. Assumir as responsabilidades pelos seus actos
5. Ser assíduo
6. Ser pontual
7. Trazer sempre o material necessário e organizado
8. Complementar as aprendizagens com estudo regular
9. Fazer sempre os TPC
10. Frequentar e empenhar-se nas aulas de apoio, tutorias... propostas neste Plano
11. Criar um ambiente de trabalho/estudo que permita a concentração
12. Informar o EE dos resultados de avaliação e apresentar os testes/fichas para assinar

Em / / , assumo a responsabilidade de me empenhar no cumprimento deste Plano:
Assinatura:
Observações:

A pesar de convocado, nunca compareci [ ]
Aprovação pelo Conselho Pedagógico

Plano de Acompanhamento – para ser aplicado no ano seguinte, porque o aluno ficou retido.

O Conselho Pedagógico aprovou / não aprovou o presente Plano de Acompanhamento para ser aplicado no próximo ano lectivo de ________.

Observações:
Presidente do Conselho Pedagógico

__ __ __

Avaliações do Plano:

Em __ / __ / __, o Conselho de Turma decidiu:

a) Dar este Plano por cumprido, uma vez que o aluno ultrapassou as dificuldades nele identificadas.
b) Dar continuidade a este Plano, uma vez que o aluno ainda não ultrapassou as suas dificuldades.
c) Dar continuidade a este Plano, uma vez que o aluno ainda não ultrapassou todas as suas dificuldades, mas observando-se as seguintes alterações:

Em __ / __ / __, o Conselho de Turma decidiu:

a) Dar este Plano por cumprido, uma vez que o aluno ultrapassou as dificuldades nele identificadas.
b) Dar continuidade a este Plano, uma vez que o aluno ainda não ultrapassou as suas dificuldades.
c) Dar continuidade a este Plano, uma vez que o aluno ainda não ultrapassou todas as suas dificuldades, mas observando-se as seguintes alterações:

Auto-avaliação intermédia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medidas da responsabilidade do aluno</th>
<th>Sempre</th>
<th>Às vezes</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Parecer do DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Não concordo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cumprir as regras, melhorando nomeadamente o comportamento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Estive atento/concentrado, tirando oportunamente as dúvidas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participei activa e organizadamente na realização das tarefas propostas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assumi as responsabilidades pelos meus actos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fui assíduo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fui pontual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trouxe sempre o material necessário e organizado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complementei as aprendizagens com estudo regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fiz sempre os TPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Frequentei e empenhei-me nas aulas de apoio, tutorias...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propostas neste Plano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Criei um ambiente de trabalho/estudo que permite a concentração</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Informei o EE dos resultados de avaliação e apresentei os testes/fichas para assinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Em __ / __ / __, tomei conhecimento da avaliação feita pelo último Conselho de Turma relativamente a este Plano e votei a assumir a responsabilidade de me empenhar no cumprimento do mesmo. Assinatura:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medidas da responsabilidade do aluno</th>
<th>Sempre</th>
<th>Às vezes</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Parecer do DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Não concordo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cumprir as regras, melhorando nomeadamente o comportamento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Estive atento/concentrado, tirando oportunamente as dúvidas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participei activa e organizadamente na realização das tarefas propostas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assumi as responsabilidades pelos meus actos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fui assíduo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fui pontual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trouxe sempre o material necessário e organizado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complementei as aprendizagens com estudo regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fiz sempre os TPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Frequnetiei e empenhei-me nas aulas de apoio, tutorias...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propostas neste Plano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Criei um ambiente de trabalho/estudo que permite a concentração</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Informei o EE dos resultados de avaliação e apresentei os testes/fichas para assinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Em __ / __ / __, tomei conhecimento da avaliação feita pelo último Conselho de Turma relativamente a este Plano e votei a assumir a responsabilidade de me empenhar no cumprimento do mesmo. Assinatura:
### Medidas da responsabilidade do encarregado de educação

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medidas</th>
<th>Sempre</th>
<th>Às vezes</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Parecer do DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Incentive a prática de atitudes correctas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Valorize as aprendizagens escolares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contacte periodicamente o DT e use/verifique regularmente a caderneta e os cadernos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsabilize o seu educando pelo cumprimento das suas obrigações (assiduidade, pontualidade, material, horário de estudo...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Controle a assiduidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Controle a pontualidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Controle o material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Verifique o cumprimento do horário de estudo estabelecido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Verifique/apoie a feitura dos TPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Incentive/Controle a frequências das actividades de recuperação previstas neste Plano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Proporcionel um bom ambiente de trabalho/estudo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dialogue com o aluno sobre progressos/sucessos e dificuldades e assinale os testes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observações:**


Em ___/___/___, tomei conhecimento da avaliação feita pelo último Conselho de Turma relativamente a este Plano e volto a assumir a responsabilidade de me empenhar no cumprimento do mesmo. Assinatura:


*Assinatura*

### Medidas da responsabilidade do encarregado de educação

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medidas</th>
<th>Sempre</th>
<th>Às vezes</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Parecer do DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Incentive a prática de atitudes correctas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Valorize as aprendizagens escolares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contacte periodicamente o DT e use/verifique regularmente a caderneta e os cadernos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsabilize o seu educando pelo cumprimento das suas obrigações (assiduidade, pontualidade, material, horário de estudo...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Controle a assiduidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Controle a pontualidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Controle o material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Verifique o cumprimento do horário de estudo estabelecido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Verifique/apoie a feitura dos TPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Incentive/Controle a frequências das actividades de recuperação previstas neste Plano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Proporcionel um bom ambiente de trabalho/estudo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dialogue com o aluno sobre progressos/sucessos e dificuldades e assinale os testes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observações:**


Em ___/___/___, tomei conhecimento da avaliação feita pelo último Conselho de Turma relativamente a este Plano e volto a assumir a responsabilidade de me empenhar no cumprimento do mesmo. Assinatura:


*Assinatura*

### Avaliação de Final do Ano

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinas/NAC</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>EVT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EMRC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>neg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Níveis/ Av. Qualitativa-3.º P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Em ___/___/___:** Aprovado ☐ Não Aprovado ☐ Assinatura do DT
Appendix 26. Matrix of problems and explanations in England and Portugal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repertoire of labels</strong></td>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Cannot follow peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA/ SA+ / Statement</td>
<td>3/2008; SEN, impairments, disabilities, autism CEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>50/2005; difficulties in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below average/ booster child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability, medical needs, behaviour needs, social issues (SEBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repertoire of explanations</strong></td>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Physical limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability, medical needs</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties/ struggling</td>
<td>Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family issues</td>
<td>Lack of motivation/ work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Gaps in knowledge’</td>
<td>Poor previous teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>