

Strategy for Special Provision – Staffordshire District Inclusion Support Model

Decision Matrix v2.0

Date: 02/10/23



With pride. With purpose. With you.

Evaluation Process

SEDIS Proposals will be evaluated in 3 stages.

- Stage 1 – Expressions of Interest will be reviewed and scored against the outcomes and criteria listed below.
- Stage 2 – Those who meet the threshold will be invited to a meeting with Local Authority/Health Officers to further understand how the proposal fits with the published SEDIS model.
- Stage 3 – If a building or capital requirements feature as part of the proposal an assessment of this will be undertaken.

A partnership approach will be utilised to form the Evaluation Panel, with representatives sought from Health, Social Care, Education Providers and Parent Carer Forum.

Outcomes and Criteria

The following criteria will be used to evaluate and score expressions of interest submitted to deliver Staffordshire Enhanced District Inclusion Support Model.

Outcomes		Link to EOI section	Criteria
Quality delivery	1	C 1 - 8	The proposal meets the SEDIS Model principles and objects and demonstrates how it will support the gaps identified in the gap analysis. Proposal is clear and shows thorough planning.
	2	D1 – D2	The Lead Provider demonstrates good outcomes for children and young people. <i>This could include Post 16 destinations, numbers of pupils who are NEET at the end of Y11 Post 16 NEET, High Attendance/Low Absence/Low long-term absence. Performance data – close to national, Performance data for disadvantaged/SEND data –Progress data – SEND pupils, Ofsted report findings.</i>
	3	D3	Appropriately skilled, trained and experienced staff who will deliver in-reach and outreach provision or plans to upskill staff/recruit staff with the required skills. This could include: National SENCO qualification, SEND Training/Peer Review, RRP/Trauma informed training, evidence of utilising evidence-based practice, evidence of training delivered/undertaken and impact realised in setting.

Outcomes		Link to EOI section	Criteria
Commitment to inclusive practice	4	E1	Evidence of positive practices in terms of inclusion This may include: Inclusion strategies to support attendance, examples of promoting individual wellbeing, achievement of Inclusion quality marks, environmental/training audits completed as part of graduated approach/inclusion
	5	E2	The Lead Provider has provided evidence to demonstrate a proactive approach to preventing exclusion.
	6	E3	Evidence of embedding relational and restorative approaches

Outcomes		Link to EOI section	Criteria
Increased community resilience	7	F1	Evidence of meaningful engagement with children and their parents/carers/families and demonstrates ability to work in a multi systemic way
	8	F2-3	Evidence of strong commitment to building capacity of child's 'home school' setting
	9	F4	Strong commitment to partnership work, having links with special provision and health and social care partners, including active involvement in SEND and Inclusion Hubs

Outcomes		Link to EOI section	Criteria
Financially and physically appropriate	10	G8, G10	The proposed base is accessible with suitable space and environment to meet the needs of the young people.
	11	G8-9	The location proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the needs identified in the gap analysis for the specific client group in the specific area. • demonstrates sufficient travel routes/connectivity to enable both in-reach and out-reach approaches to be viable and reduce travel times for young people and delivery staff. • is accessible by public transport.
	12	G11-12	The proposal demonstrates cost-effectiveness and financial sustainability in the long term. Provides value for money to SCC, does not require significant capital investment in development of the base. Demonstrates how the resource will be sustained longer term.

Scoring methodology

3	Strong evidence against criteria	<p>Response fully demonstrates that meets requirements with substantial relevant detail/evidence provided.</p> <p>Highly skilled staff to deliver project, impact demonstrated, clear partnership approach to application demonstrated, provides good value for money, substantially fills gaps identified, positive inclusive practices demonstrated</p>
2	Acceptable evidence against criteria	<p>Response largely demonstrates that meets requirements, with sufficient detail/evidence provided to support statements.</p> <p>Suitable skilled staff in place or plans for this, demonstrates good partnerships, demonstrates inclusive practices costs appear realistic and present reasonable value for money, fills a number of gaps identified</p>
1	Minimal evidence against criteria	<p>Little detail or evidence to answer the question. Basic and minimal information provided.</p> <p>Lack of suitable skills staffing, no/limited partnership approach demonstrated, project costs seem unrealistic/little evidence of value for money/limited evidence of inclusive practice/ fills some gaps identified</p>
0	No response/Non-compliance	<p>No response/insufficient information to score.</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria</p>

