

Research Space

Journal article

The coproduction illusion: considering the relative success rates and efficiency rates of securing an Education, Health and Care plan when requested by families or education professionals Soan, Sue and Boddison, Adam

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Boddison, A. and Soan, S. (2021), The Coproduction illusion: considering the relative success rates and efficiency rates of securing an Education, Health and Care plan when requested by families or education professionals. J Res Spec Educ Needs. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12545, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12545. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited."

Tables

Table 1: The expert voice- language used in the Children and Families Act 2014

Word searched	Number of times used in			
	Act			
Co-operating	6			
Co-operation	3			
Advise	14			
Adviser	12 (Mediation adviser)			
information	150			
Informed	5			
Inform	9			
Coproduction	0			
Collaborate	0			
Collaboration	0			
Collaborative/ly	0			
Considers	20			
Involve	33			
Involved	4			
Partnership	0 (in relation to SEN/D)			

Table 2: Terms used to explain the sharing of information

Word searchedNumber of times used in ActCo-operate31Co-operation2Advise3Adviser33information493Informed28Inform599Coproduction1Collaborate1Collaboration10Collaborative/ly4Considers223Involve33Involved11Partnership22Integrated16		1			
Co-operate 31 Co-operation 2 Advise 3 Adviser 33 information 493 Informed 28 Inform 599 Coproduction 1 Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Word searched	Number of times used in			
Co-operation 2 Advise 3 Adviser 33 information 493 Inform 599 Coproduction 1 Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22		Act			
Advise 3 Adviser 33 information 493 Inform 599 Coproduction 1 Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Co-operate	31			
Adviser 33 information 493 Inform 599 Coproduction 1 Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Co-operation	2			
information493Inform28Inform599Coproduction1Collaborate1Collaboration10Collaborative/ly4Considers223Involve33Involved11Partnership22	Advise	3			
Informed28Inform599Coproduction1Collaborate1Collaboration10Collaborative/ly4Considers223Involve33Involved11Partnership22	Adviser	33			
Inform599Coproduction1Collaborate1Collaboration10Collaborative/ly4Considers223Involve33Involved11Partnership22	information	493			
Coproduction 1 Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Informed	28			
Collaborate 1 Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Inform	599			
Collaboration 10 Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Coproduction	1			
Collaborative/ly 4 Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Collaborate	1			
Considers 223 Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Collaboration	10			
Involve 33 Involved 11 Partnership 22	Collaborative/ly	4			
Involved 11 Partnership 22	Considers	223			
Partnership 22	Involve	33			
	Involved	11			
Integrated 16	Partnership	22			
	Integrated	16			

Table 3: Summary of success rate data by source

	Mean Average Success Rate (2017/18)	
		(proportion of requests for an EHC
		needs assessment resulting in a plan
		being issued)
lest eds	Families (e.g. parents, carers, children	55.2%
Source of Request for an EHC Needs	or young people)	(n = 121)
rce of	Educational professionals (e.g.	79.0%
Sourc for a	schools, colleges or SENCOs)	(n = 122)
	Proportion of LAs for which the	96%
success rate was higher for educational professionals than families		
		$(n = 116)^1$
		The higher proportion of success rates
Statistical significance		(educational settings compared to
		families) is statistically significant using
		a 1-tail t-test at the 1% level.

_

¹ 6 LAs removed as source of data unavailable

Table 4: Summary of efficiency rate data by source of request

		Mean Average Efficiency Rate			
		(2017/18)			
		(proportion of total EHC plans issued,			
		that are issued within 20 weeks)			
est eds	Families (e.g. parents, carers, children	53.6%			
Source of Request for an EHC Needs	or young people)	(n = 109)			
rce of	Educational professionals (e.g.	61.9%			
Source for an	schools, colleges or SENCOs)	(n = 112)			
	Proportion of LAs for which the	71%			
nce	efficiency rate was higher for	7 1 70			
efficiency rate was higher for educational professionals than families		$(n = 109)^2$			
		The higher proportion of efficiency rates			
Statistical significance		(educational settings compared to			
		families) is statistically significant using			
		a 1-tail t-test at the 1% level.			

.

² 13 LAs removed as comparative data unavailable

- Level 1: cooperation services work together toward consistent goals and complementary services, whilst maintaining their independence.
- Level 2: collaboration services plan together and address issues of overlap, duplication, and gaps in service provision towards common outcomes.
- Level 3: coordination services work together in a planned and systematic manner towards shared and agreed goals.
- Level 4: merger/integration different services become one organisation in order to enhance service delivery.

(Frost, 2005,13)

Table 6: Table SEND_5 Special Educational Needs: Appeals broken down by child's age group¹, 2013-14 to 2018-19

Appeals registered:	Age range			Total
	Under 5	5-16	Post-16	appeals
1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014	10%	89%	1%	4,063
1 September 2014 to 31 August 2015	10%	85%	5%	3,147
1 September 2015 to 31 August 2016	8%	81%	11%	3,712
1 September 2016 to 31 August 2017	7%	81%	12%	4,725
1 September 2017 to 31 August 2018	7%	80%	13%	5,679
1 September 2018 to 31 August 2019	9%	80%	11%	7,002

Source: GAPS2

Notes				
1. Age of the child as at the day the appeal was				
registered				
Please note that the previous SEND_5 table with local authority				
appeal rates is now published in June. See the latest statistics here:				

https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/tribunal-statistics-quarterly-january-to-march-2019

Table 7: Proportions of EHC plans refused by primary reason

Academic	Combined	Refusal to	Refusal to	Refusal to	Refusal to
Year	Refusals	Undertake	Undertake	Make an	Make an
	(refusal to assess	an EHC	an EHC	EHC Plan	EHC Plan
	+ refusal to make	Needs	Needs		(Proportion)
	an EHC plan	Assessment	Assessment		
	following an		(Proportion)		
	assessment)				
2015/16	1506	1185	78.7%	321	21.3%
2016/17	1865	1494	80.1%	371	19.9%
2017/18	2232	1717	76.9%	515	23.1%
2018/19	2822	2173	77.0%	649	23.0%

Data available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/851610/Tribunals_SEND_18-19_Tables.ods