

# Evaluation of Whole-School Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Review on attainment, attendance and wellbeing at school, for secondary school-aged children in England

<b>Submission date</b> 12/03/2020	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 16/03/2020	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 09/02/2026	<b>Condition category</b> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

Schools provide support and guidance for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) through school Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinators (SENDCos). To make sure the training for SENDCos is based on the best evidence, this research aims to test the effectiveness of a programme of training and development for SENDCos. The training programme is known as Whole School SEND Review. Whole School SEND Review is designed for SENDCos working in English secondary schools. It has been developed by nasen (<https://nasen.org.uk/>), an organisation that supports SENDCos and others working in schools to assist SEND and all pupils through providing them with training and information. This study examines whether training SENDCos along the lines of Whole School SEND Review can raise the attainment of pupils with SEND, reduce their absences and exclusions from school, and generally raise their wellbeing. In addition, to examine whether positive outcomes can be found among all pupils, not just those with SEND.

### Who can participate?

This trial is open to secondary schools and their SENDCos in five areas of the country by invitation: The North; East Midlands, South Yorkshire and Humberside; Southwest; South Central England and Northwest London, and West Midlands. Within participating schools all pupils in Years 8 and 9 at September 2019 are recruited to the study.

### What does the study involve?

Schools that come forward to participate are divided into two groups at random. One of the groups of schools receives the Whole Schools SEND Review programme. Schools in the control group cannot take part in Whole Schools SEND Review during the lifetime of the study. For schools participating in this study there are requirements relating to the WSS Review programme itself and the research. From the perspective of the programme, participating

schools must also be willing to release their SENDCo for 4 days for the following commitments:

1. Initial training (1 day)
  2. Peer review of partner school (each participating school is paired with another participating school and SENDCos review each other's work) (1 day)
  3. Update date days – where participating schools meet with the organisation running the programme to receive an update and where continued involvement is promoted (2 days).
- Furthermore, schools must provide the following release time for SENDCos to complete responsibilities:

1. Preparation for training and review (1-2 days)
2. Written report writing (1 day)
3. Visits to the school by programme developers (2 days)

A Senior Leader, in addition to the SENDCo, must support the SENDCo in preparing for the review, participate in the review and meet with the programme developers on each of the school visits. From the perspective of the research, schools are asked to provide data from their management data systems to the research team at three points in time: at the beginning of the study (January-April, 2020), September 2022 and September 2023. These data allow the researchers to track pupils' marks in national GCSE examinations, and their absences and exclusions from school. In addition, schools are asked to distribute questionnaires to pupils at three points in time: June/July 2020, 2021 and 2022. These questionnaires ask pupils about their wellbeing.

What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

One of the groups of schools receives the Whole Schools SEND Review programme and therefore their pupils and staff benefit from it, should it prove beneficial. Schools in the control group cannot take part in Whole Schools SEND Review during the lifetime of the study and therefore cannot benefit. They receive £1000 honorarium in recognition of their agreement to supply data to the research team. All schools participating in the study contribute to the public good through enabling the research to take place.

Where is the study run from?

The research is run by a team from the Policy Research and Evaluation Unit (PERU) and Education and Social Research Institute (ESRI) both based at Manchester Metropolitan University. The Whole School SEND Review programme is run by nasen.

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?

July 2019 to January 2024

Who is funding the study?

Education Endowment Foundation (UK)

Who is the main contact?

Prof. Stephen Morris  
s.morris@mmu.ac.uk

## Contact information

**Type(s)**

Scientific

**Contact name**

Prof Stephen Morris

## ORCID ID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6869-8933>

## Contact details

Policy Evaluation and Research Unit  
Department of Sociology  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
Geoffrey Manton Building  
4 Rosamond Street West  
Manchester  
United Kingdom  
M15 6LL  
+44 (0)7887 553926  
s.morris@mmu.ac.uk

## Additional identifiers

### Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)

Nil known

### ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)

Nil known

### Protocol serial number

251008

## Study information

### Scientific Title

The effect of Whole School Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Review on attainment, attendance and wellbeing at school, for children aged 11-14 in England: a cluster randomised trial

### Acronym

WSSSEND Review

### Study objectives

Primary research question:

1. What is the difference in average Marks in GCSE English Language among pupils with a SEND designation, in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

Secondary research questions:

2. What is the difference in average Marks in GCSE English Language among all pupils in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to all pupils in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

3. What is the difference in average Marks in GCSE Mathematics among pupils with a SEND designation, in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

4. What is the difference in average Marks in GCSE Mathematics among all pupils in schools

exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

5. What is the difference in average Grade in GCSE English Language among pupils with a SEND designation, in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

6. What is the difference in average Grade in GCSE Mathematics among pupils with a SEND designation in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

7. What is the difference in the probability of observing at least one unauthorised absence among pupils with a SEND designation in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

8. What is the average number of all absences among pupils with a SEND designation in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

9. What is the difference in the probability of observing at least one exclusion (fixed-term or permanent) among pupils with a SEND designation in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

10. What is the difference in the average score for total difficulties obtained from the student self-completion SDQ among pupils with a SEND designation in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils with a SEND designation in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

11. What is the difference in the average score for total difficulties obtained from the student self-completion SDQ among all pupils in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to all pupils in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

Research questions - subgroups:

12. What is the difference in average Marks in GCSE English Language among pupils that have ever qualified for free school meals in schools exposed to Whole School SEND Review, compared to pupils that have ever qualified for free school meals in control schools exposed to business as usual conditions?

### **Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

### **Ethics approval(s)**

Approved 31/10/2019, Manchester Metropolitan University (Faculty of Education, Ethical Review Committee, Manchester Metropolitan University, Brooks Building, 53 Bonsall Street, Manchester, M15 6GX, UK; +44 (0)161 247 3700, FOE-Ethics@mmu.ac.uk), ref: 12103

### **Study design**

School cluster randomised trial

### **Primary study design**

Interventional

### **Study type(s)**

Other

### **Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Low attainment in national examinations among children identified as SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities)

## **Interventions**

The school recruitment process is as follows. The WSS team will identify schools and collect initial data. Schools will be asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding which provides information about the project and its aims, potential benefits for participating schools, a timetable of activities, data protection issues and responsibilities of all parties involved. Schools will issue a withdrawal notice to all parents of students in Year 8 and Year 9. Parents will have 2 weeks to respond to this although they have the right to withdraw their child at any time. FFT will then collect baseline data from each school.

The SEND Review aspires to be an approach that is constructive, collaborative and owned by the school (rather than an audit or inspection process). Its aims are for school improvement in SEND provision without 'punitive' interventions. It seeks to draw on and support existing expertise and good practice within and across schools. The intervention is delivered to SENDCos (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Co-ordinators) who are expected to oversee Whole School SEND (WSS) within their own school and to develop and implement a SEND Development Plan, targeting areas for improvement. The WSS Process aims to raise awareness and give SENDCos more status such that they can become agents of change. Their role should shift from one with a pastoral focus to one that drives change in both teaching and learning.

As tested in this trial, the intervention will be delivered across five regions: The North; East Midlands, South Yorkshire and Humber; Southwest; South Central England and Northwest London, and West Midlands. The underlying model is peer-to-peer support which is facilitated by partnering schools. However, in this project the partnering of schools is pragmatic and primarily based on geographic proximity although other considerations such as advice from the regional nasen co-ordinator will also contribute to decisions that are made. The partnerships may work out differently in different contexts; some may work well, others may require greater levels of support from the central WSS team.

The WSS Review Guide, the key documentary resource, explores eight areas to help schools to ensure the effectiveness of their SEND practice:

1. Outcomes for pupils with SEND
2. The quality of teaching and learning for pupils with SEND
3. Leadership of SEND
4. The efficient use of resources
5. Assessment and identification
6. Working with parents and carers and pupils with SEND
7. Monitoring, tracking and evaluation
8. The quality of SEND provision

Additional supporting documentation provided through WSS Review includes: the WSS Review Guide, reporting templates, and SENDCos guidance. These and other documents will be revised or created for this project. Other resources available from nasen targeting different stakeholder groups and designed to support school improvement of SEND provision will also be shared with participating schools.

The programme is structured around five key contacts between nasen and the school/SENDCos:

### **1. SEND REVIEWER TRAINING (JUNE 2020)**

This one-day face-to-face event for SENDCos, facilitated by WSS Project Directors, aims to:

1. Outline the project vision
2. Outline the project aims
3. Provide SEND Reviewer training
4. Provide Peer mentoring training

There will be one training session in each region which schools that have elected to take part and been randomised to the intervention group will be invited to attend. Training will be delivered based on a standardised plan. Its content will be targeted specifically at secondary schools. SENDCos from partner schools will attend together, and one aim of the day is to build the relationship between them. The day will also include practical activities to increase participants' confidence in conducting the WSS review process.

The reviewer training will be followed by a 4-week period (June 2020 – July 2020) in which the partner schools do a peer-to-peer review of each other's SEND provision. Firstly, each school undertakes a self-evaluation, involving the SENDCo and at least one other senior leader. The SENDCo should provide the self-evaluation and relevant documents (e.g. school Ofsted report, school SEND policies, school improvement plan, staff CPD programme, student data, staffing structure) to their partner school three days before the peer review visit. The self-evaluation template, intended to record a reflection on current practice, provides suggested themes and areas to explore for each of the 8 areas outlined in the SEND Review Guide. The SENDCos are required to identify (and celebrate) strengths, areas for development, and stakeholders who might be involved in initiatives to support SEND students.

The schools then review their partner school's documents, the self-evaluation report, any relevant information from partner school's website and then visit the partner school to undertake the review. The visit could include a meeting with the headteacher, other key staff members, and observations of activities targeting SEND provision. That is, the purpose of the visit is for the peer reviewer to observe what is actually happening in its partner school, gather further information and get a deeper understanding of the school context and local issues. The school conducting the review makes suggestions through a reporting template, identifying strengths, areas for development and key recommendations for next steps. This approach is collaborative and requires professional honesty. Its rationale is to establish shared perceptions, triangulate evidence, develop a shared vision and identify next steps. The WSS team will ensure that this process takes place through continued email contact with the schools. Completed reporting templates will be sent to the Project Directors no later than one week before the first engagement day. A Project Director will quality assure the peer review on its receipt.

Should a school drop out of the intervention arm of the study prior to completing the peer review process, the remaining school will join another pair to form a trio or a Project Director will undertake the review depending on the stage of the process that has been reached at the time. Should a school drop out of the intervention arm of the study after completing the peer review process, the remaining school will still receive peer support through the regional support network of schools and will be prioritised in the WSS team school visit schedule.

## 2. ENGAGEMENT DAY (SEPTEMBER 2020)

The format of these days will be flexible and tailored to meet participating schools' needs. The focus of each regional event, involving a minimum of 16 SENDCos (a minimum of 80 overall), will be based on the peer reviews of schools from that region, and the strengths and weaknesses identified. The discussions will also be responsive to the participating SENDCos' concerns. The engagement day will facilitate a regional community of practice for sharing knowledge, ideas and experience, as well as providing opportunities for collaborating and developing local networks.

The aims of this one-day f2f event for SENDCos, facilitated by WSS Project Directors, will be to:

1. Reflect on SEND Reviews
2. Provide tailored SEND CPD based on regional feedback from peer reviews
3. Provide strategic SEND Leadership training
4. Draft the SEND Development Plan

SEND Development Plan: SENDCos will begin to write their school's SEND development plan at the first engagement day. This will include three identified areas for development, relevant actions for each area and key stakeholders to involve. It should be shared with senior leaders and governors at a Full Governing Body meeting before the first school support visit by a WSS Project Director.

There will be email contact over the summer to enable the WSS team to keep touch with the participating schools.

### 3. FIRST SUPPORT VISIT FROM WSS PROJECT DIRECTOR (OCT 2020 – JAN 2021)

WSS project directors will undertake a one-day support visit to all intervention schools in the autumn term to meet the SENDCo and a senior leader, and review the school's SEND Development Plan. The meeting is only with the focal school – the partner school does not attend. School visits will include members of the senior leadership team and governors to ensure high-level buy-in.

The aims of the first visit will be to:

1. Address the SENDCo-led agenda for the day
2. Provide a one-to-one coaching session with a Project Director
3. Have a meeting with the headteacher
4. Review the SEND Development Plan

The SENDCo will be expected to work with senior leaders to implement the SEND Development Plan following the first support visit. Less confident SENDCos (ascertained at Engagement Day 1) will be visited first to ensure that they are better placed to implement their plans straight away.

### 4. ENGAGEMENT DAY 2 (JAN 2021 – FEB 2021)

This will provide partner schools with another opportunity to network with each other, creating a horizontal space for sharing concerns and experiences.

The aims of the one-day f2f event for SENDCos, facilitated by WSS Project Directors, are to:

1. Provide tailored SEND CPD based on regional feedback from school visits
2. Review engagement of stakeholders
3. Facilitate regional sharing of best practice.

Following this event, SENDCos will continue to work with senior leaders to implement SEND Development Plan. The WSS Review team will ensure that SENDCos and SLT reflect regularly on progress through email and telephone contact, with a focus on teacher self-efficacy and school-wide responsibility for ensuring access and progress of all children.

### 5. SECOND SUPPORT VISIT FROM WSS PROJECT DIRECTORS (MARCH 2021 – JUNE 2021)

The second visit to each school will discuss the action plan implementation.

The aims of the visit are to:

1. Provide a one-to-one coaching session with a Project Director;
2. Review progress and identify next steps for SEND provision;
3. Collect anecdotal evidence to support a final review report (one year on) from the WSS Review team.

SENDCos will be expected to continue to work alongside the headteacher to ensure prioritisation of and commitment to high-quality SEND provision, guided by the SEND Development Plan.

## CONTROL SCHOOLS

Schools allocated to the control group will receive a financial payment of £1,500, in two instalments (July 2021, July 2022), on completion of the follow-up administration of the SDQ with students in Year 9 and Year 8 in September 2019, but will not participate in the WSS Review process. Schools in the control group will not have access to the WSS Review process during the study period. They will, however, be able to access the WSS Review process from September 2023. The researchers recognise that schools in the control group may decide to develop SEND provision by accessing alternative resources during the intervention period. The implementation process evaluation (IPE) carried out as part of this trial (see below) will gather data about this. It is an issue that will be considered when interpreting impact analyses. In this project, 'business as usual' will not necessarily mean that no changes in practices have taken place; in fact, over such an extended period time it is highly unlikely that there will be no changes to SEND provision among control group schools. The issue, from a research design perspective, is whether the school's knowledge of the trial and their allocation to control influences their decisions around the development of support for SEND students.

Following discussions with the intervention developers and the Education Endowment Foundation, attainment at GCSE in English language for pupils designated SEND, in the form of exam marks, was chosen as the primary outcome. Roughly four in ten of the GCSE cohort of 2016 had been designated SEND at some point during their prior school career, suggesting that the GCSE entry rate for SEND pupils is very high – we estimate around 96 per cent (Department for Education, 2020). The intervention logic model suggests that WSS Review is hypothesised to raise attainment in national examinations at the end of KS4, particularly for students with SEND. The intervention is theorised to bring about a change in school culture, promoting a supportive and inclusive environment in which students with SEND can flourish as well as influence teaching and practice in the classroom towards the needs of SEND pupils. Further, that these changes will be reflected in attainment for SEND as well as non-SEND pupils.

English language was chosen as the primary outcome measure because command of written and spoken language is important in accessing learning in general and is a determinant of future advancement. The reliance on national examinations for assessment is partly a practical decision but also one that reflects substantive concerns. From a practical perspective, adopting attainment at GCSE as the primary outcome has a number of advantages. First, considerable resources are devoted by exam boards to the writing and validation of GCSE questions, therefore examination Marks might be considered reliable and valid measures of attainment in and of themselves. Second, the costs of collecting pupil level GCSE results are low compared to the costs of administering commercial standardised assessment tests. Third, unlike administering separate standardised assessments of literacy and language, using GCSE Marks as the primary outcome imposes no additional data collection burden on schools. Fourth, as a measure it is also less affected by loss to follow-up than the alternatives.

Whilst the focus is on Marks, given these might be considered sensitive to small changes in attainment and provide a continuous attainment score, GCSE grades are also of interest. Grades are well understood. Results showing an intervention has an effect on average GCSE grade is clear to, and interpretable by, stakeholders. Moreover, as closing the attainment gap is a central concern to EEF and it is Grade that ultimately determines advancement, Grade in English is included as a separate secondary outcome measure.

In order to obtain Marks, schools in the sample will be approached by the Fisher Family Trust and asked for the Marks obtained by individual students at GCSE and provided to the school by exam boards.

Secondary outcomes can be grouped into three categories: a) further attainment outcomes; b) attendance and exclusions outcomes; and c) wellbeing.

#### Further pupil-level attainment

The underlying intervention theory provides an account of how WSS is expected to raise general attainment, specifically for SEND pupils but also among the wider student body. As a result the selection of secondary outcomes is informed by the expectation that aspects of attainment other than language and literacy will improve as a consequence of WSS. Given the importance of attainment in mathematics for future advancement, Marks at GCSE mathematics are chosen as a secondary outcome for SEND and all pupils separately. As discussed above, interest lies not only in performance in national examinations as a form of assessment but also achievement in terms of Grade. For this reason, Grades achieved in mathematics and English language are specified as separate secondary outcomes.

The process of obtaining the Marks for pupils in our sample in GCSE mathematics will be the same as that described above for English Language. Grades will be obtained on behalf of MMU by FFT using their Aspire system at September 2022 for Year 9 pupils (at September 2019), and September 2023 for Year 8s (at September 2019). Grades obtained in both English and mathematics will be on a 1-9 scale with unclassified marks coded to '0'. The measures of Grade achieved by pupils will be equivalent to those available through the NPD.

#### Pupil attendance and exclusions

The programme theory of change suggests that Whole School SEND Review aims to bring about a change in school culture, promoting an inclusive and supportive environment as well as addressing specifically the needs of children with SEND in the classroom. These needs can often go unmet leading to poor attendance and in some cases exclusion from school.

At the point GCSE Grades are extracted from school data systems by FFT, data will be obtained on authorised and unauthorised absences for pupils for the school year 2021/22 for Year 9 pupils (at September 2019) and the school year 2022/23 for Year 8 pupils (at September 2019). These data will be transformed into outcome measures and used as dependent variables in the secondary analysis. For authorised absences, the outcome measure will be a count of the number of authorised absences in the relevant school year depending on the cohort being considered. For unauthorised absences, because there are fewer of these, a binary dependent variable will be created for each pupil coded to '1' where an unauthorised absence is observed in the relevant school year, '0' otherwise.

At the same points in time that attainment and attendance data for each pupil in the relevant-year-group-cohorts are extracted, data on exclusions from school will also be collected recorded over the same school years: 2021/22 for Year 9 pupils and 2022/23 for Year 8 pupils. Data on both temporary fixed term and permanent exclusions will be obtained. From these data binary outcome measures will be derived capturing whether any exclusions from school, either fixed-term or permanent, were recorded in the relevant school years.

#### Pupil wellbeing

As discussed above, it is anticipated and consistent with the intervention theory of change, that pupil wellbeing will improve as a result of exposure to WSS Review. Pupil wellbeing is measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), a behavioural screening questionnaire for 3-17-year-olds. The SDQ provides a measure of the psychological adjustment of the respondent (or their psychopathology) (Goodman, 2001). There are three versions of the questionnaire, one that can be administered to parents, one administered to teachers

/practitioners, and a self-completion instrument for young people. The researchers will administer the single-sided self-completion SDQ for 11-17-year-olds to the enumerated sample of pupils in both Years 8 and 9 at baseline in June/July 2020, that is prior to the commencement of the intervention in September 2020 (but post-randomisation – which is a limitation of the study design ) and then again at June/July 2021 (for Year 9s) and June/July 2022 (for Year 8s). The choice of timing of the follow-up SDQ measurements was informed by the need to avoid administering the instrument in Year 11, when there are significant calls on teachers' time and school resources in general, and also to provide for the possibility of using well-being as a mediating variable in analyses of attainment (Hayes, 2017), thereby taking into account the required temporal ordering of measurements to permit this.

The SDQ measure of interest is the 'total number of difficulties' score. The SDQ contains 25 items, 20 of which form four subscales: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity /inattention and peer problems. A score on each sub-scale is obtained and then the total number of difficulties derived from summing across the subscales. The additional five items form a separate prosocial behaviour scale which we are not intending to use in our analysis. The validity and reliability of the SDQ are discussed in Goodman & Goodman (2009), Goodman & Goodman (2011) and Goodman, (2001). The SDQs at baseline and follow-up are administered by teachers and teaching assistants and returned to FFT and scored blind.

Both primary and secondary analysis will follow the intention to treat principle.

Focusing first on the primary analysis, statistical estimates of the effect of exposure on marks at GCSE English will be obtained from a hierarchical linear model (the estimator), in which pupils are clustered within schools. This model will be fitted to data for SEND pupils only. Three model specifications are proposed, where the mark in the form of a z score for each pupil is the dependent variable, with the following covariates :

Specification 1: binary intervention group indicator coded to '1' if the school is assigned to the intervention '0' otherwise, plus regional dummy variables (representing strata);

Specification 2: As above, with KS2 Reading raw score as a covariate expressed as a departure from the school mean for each pupil at the pupil level, and as a school average departure from the overall mean at the school level

Specification 3: As specification 12, with additional covariates representing sex, month of birth, unauthorised absences in the year prior to randomisation, and Free School Meals variables as further covariates.

The effect size, consistent with Hedges' g, will be obtained from Specification 2, as set out in EEF guidance (Education Endowment Foundation, 2018).

The estimator for the treatment effect is the mean of the outcome in the treatment group minus mean in the control group, and is derived from the coefficient obtained on the binary intervention group indicator from Specification 2 above. The denominator is the variances at the school and pupil levels respectively. A sample estimate for the denominator is obtained from the total unconstrained pooled variance as described in Hedges (2007), who also provides an equation for the variance of the sample estimate for the effect size. Uncertainty will be assessed through computation of 95 per cent confidence intervals and p-values.

The secondary analysis will involve estimation of effects on a range of outcomes for the full year-group cohort samples (Years 8 and 9) and for SEND pupils only (Years 8 and 9).

The analysis for Years 8 and 9 will appear in separate reports. Hypothesis tests for the treatment effects in each specification will be reported in the form of p-values and 95 per cent

confidence intervals. To limit the problems associated with family-wise error rates in considering so many hypotheses tests in the secondary analysis the Holm-Sidak step-down procedure will be used to limit Type I error rate inflation, separately for analyses conducted on the full cohort samples and the SEND only samples (Ludbrook, 1998). For secondary analysis, treatment effect estimates based on continuous outcomes will be reported as effect sizes (Hedges g), where outcomes are binary as relative risk ratios and for count outcomes as incident rate ratios.

### **Intervention Type**

Behavioural

### **Primary outcome(s)**

Attainment at GCSE in English language measured in examination marks obtained from schools for examinations held during May/June 2022 and May/June 2023

### **Key secondary outcome(s)**

1. Attainment at GCSE in English language measured in examination grades obtained from schools for examinations held during May/June 2022 and May/June 2023
2. Attainment at GCSE in mathematics measured in examination marks obtained from schools for examinations held during May/June 2022 and May/June 2023
3. Attainment at GCSE in mathematics measured in examination grades obtained from schools for examinations held during May/June 2022 and May/June 2023
4. Count of authorised absences during the school years 2021/22 and 2022/23, obtained from school records at September 2022 and 2023
5. Whether at least one unauthorised absence is recorded during the school years 2021/22 and 2022/23, obtained from school records at September 2022 and 2023
6. Whether at least one temporary exclusion from school is recorded during the school years 2021/22 and 2022/23, obtained from school records at September 2022 and 2023
7. Total difficulties reported measured using child self-completion single-sided strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) administered at June/July 2021 and June/July 2022

### **Completion date**

31/01/2024

## **Eligibility**

### **Key inclusion criteria**

School inclusion criteria are:

1. The school is a mainstream secondary school
2. The school must not have previously commissioned a SEND Review
3. The school must be located in one of the following regions (based on Regional School Commissioner areas): North, East Midlands, South Yorkshire & Humber, South Central England & North West London, South West and West Midlands
4. The school SENDCo and other members of the school leadership team have not previously engaged with WSS Review or similar audit

Pupil inclusion criteria:

1. All pupils in Years 8 and 9 within the participating school on Monday 2nd September 2019

### **Participant type(s)**

Other

**Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

**Age group**

Child

**Sex**

All

**Total final enrolment**

59971

**Key exclusion criteria**

Does not meet inclusion criteria

**Date of first enrolment**

20/11/2019

**Date of final enrolment**

31/03/2021

**Locations****Countries of recruitment**

United Kingdom

England

**Study participating centre**

**NASEN**

nasen House

4/5 Amber Business Village

Amber Close

Tamworth

England

B77 4RP

**Sponsor information****Organisation**

Education Endowment Foundation

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/03bhd6288>

# Funder(s)

## Funder type

Charity

## Funder Name

Education Endowment Foundation

## Alternative Name(s)

EducEndowFoundn, The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF), Education Endowment Foundation | London, EEF

## Funding Body Type

Private sector organisation

## Funding Body Subtype

Trusts, charities, foundations (both public and private)

## Location

United Kingdom

# Results and Publications

## Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

At the end of the trial the researchers will send data and personal data to the Education Endowment Foundation's Archive Manager, currently Fisher Family Trust, at the end of the project to be archived and will destroy all personal data they hold by 31/07/2024. Ongoing access to the trial data will be controlled by Education Endowment Foundation.

## IPD sharing plan summary

Stored in repository

## Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Protocol article</a>		10/05/2021	12/05/2021	Yes	No
<a href="#">Protocol file</a>	version 2	30/10/2020	09/02/2026	No	No
<a href="#">Statistical Analysis Plan</a>		18/11/2021	09/02/2026	No	No
<a href="#">Study website</a>		11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes