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THE FIVE PROBLEMS

CHILDREN/FAMILIES
- Reporting unmet need (SLCN)

SLT STUDENTS
- Shortage of placements
- Limited experience of hands on therapy and collaborative work in schools

SMALL INDEPENDENT SLT PRACTICE
- Unable to provide student placements
- Limited clinic space, client preference, cost

SCHOOL STAFF
- Reporting unmet need (Training, resources, support for SLCN)

TIME/COST OF PROVIDING SLT PLACEMENTS
- No clear data
How hard can it be to tackle 5 problems at once?
To find out whether this model of service delivery:

**PROJECT AIMS**

- Makes a difference to children & families
- Is beneficial for school staff
- Provides high quality placements
- Is a viable way for us to provide student placements
- Provides high quality placements
- Provides high quality placements

Talking Outcomes
SPEECH & LANGUAGE CONSULTANCY

Is cost effective & could be rolled out to schools

University of Reading

£
MEASURES USED

Therapy outcome measures (TOMs)
Talking Outcomes E-questionnaire (TOE) for parent feedback

TOE questionnaire for feedback from school staff

Reflection/analysis of data

Reading University placement questionnaire & students self-designed TOE questionnaire for student feedback

Timesheets logging all required placement tasks
Cost analysis
WHO DID WHAT BEFORE & DURING PLACEMENT?

TOMs training | Supervision | Problem solving
Resources & report templates
Liaison with clinical tutors | Student reports to uni

14 Children received assessment & 1:1 or group therapy
Some parents attended sessions & some had programmes
Staff attended project briefing, training sessions, meetings, 1:1 demos & planned targets with students
SENCO supported students & chose children for the project
SLT provided
SLT collected data re time & costs before/during/after project

Talking Outcomes
SPEECH & LANGUAGE CONSULTANCY

Support from clinical tutors

University of Reading

Final year students (MSc or BSc)
10 week placement (1 day per week)
7 or 8 days spent in schools
Assessment, meeting staff & parents, therapy & reports

Students measured outcomes, logged activities & time, supported data collection & analysis, used tech/digital knowledge
EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS WE ASKED PARENTS

- How likely would you be to recommend the Value Talking project to other parents?
- How professional was your student therapist?
- How satisfied were you with the relationship your student therapist built with your child?
- Please tell us how the therapy helped - what did your child learn or what did you or others learn?
- How satisfied were you with the way your student therapist communicated with you and others?
- How helpful did you find the written reports and intervention plans?
- Our therapists are always seeking to improve their practice. What could your student therapist have done differently?
- In the future we may consider asking parents to make a voluntary financial contribution to their child’s therapy. How much do you think a parent would donate for 6-10 sessions of speech & language therapy with a student?
WHAT PARENTS TOLD US

3/14 parents responded (hard to reach) so is this representative of group? (21% return rate)

Entirely positive feedback re students and project as a whole

All 3 felt parents could be asked for voluntary contributions of £20 - £200

QUOTE FROM PARENTS

“Personally I think it was all excellent. So patient and calm. And fun, always positive feedback from child and school teachers. I loved that I could be involved with a session. I learnt so much. Thanks”

“My son struggles to formulate sentences and now uses the storytelling glove to help with his writing. The experience has supported him both verbally and written”
14 CHILDREN RECEIVED ASSESSMENT AND THERAPY

21% (3/14) improved 1 whole point or more on one or more scale

78% of children improved ½ point or more on at least one TOM scale = clinically significant change

22% showed no change

PROGRESS BY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOM scale</th>
<th>No. improved by ½ point or more in at least one domain</th>
<th>No. improved by 1 point or more in at least one domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonological disorder</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>2/5 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLD</td>
<td>3/8 (36%)</td>
<td>1/8 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability (Comm)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Mutism</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

?reliability of unmoderated data collection by students
EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS WE ASKED SCHOOL STAFF

Q How much time, on average, did you put into the project each week?
Q What could we do better when organising another similar project?
Q How likely would you be to recommend your student therapist(s) to others?
Q Please tell us how the therapy helped - what did your pupil(s) learn?
Q What did you learn from the project?
Q How would you rate the communication skills of your student therapist(s)?
Q Our therapists are always seeking to improve their practice. What could your student therapist(s) have done differently?
Q In the future schools may be able to buy in the Value Talking service. In the current financial climate, how much do you estimate schools would be willing to pay for two SLT students for one term?
WHAT SCHOOL STAFF TOLD US

- 7 responses from 16 staff members (43% response rate)
- 6/7 gave positive scores & positive feedback for all questions
- 1/7 gave mid-range scores & constructive criticism
- 6/7 (86%) staff members reported the project took less than ½ hour per week of their time

IMPROVEMENTS REQUESTED

- More than 6 weeks therapy preferred
- Teachers to observe 1:1 sessions
- More frequent/longer meetings with students
- “understanding that teachers cannot drop everything and instantly respond to a query or request”

QUOTES FROM TEACHERS

- “This was really useful, the students gave simple tips to support the children in my class and simple changes that could be made in the classroom to support them”
- “I learnt how to better support the children with needs in my class”
EXEMPLARY QUESTIONS THAT STUDENTS WERE ASKED

- Have your placement aims been met?
- Was the feedback you received from your PE sufficient for your learning?
- How easy was it to contact your placement educator and receive a reply?
- What else could have supported you better on your placement?
- What would the ideal length of time be for this placement?
- What else could be added to the shared drive?
- Did you have sufficient time to complete your case notes on the placement day?
- How well do you feel the school accommodated you as students?
WHAT STUDENTS TOLD US

POSITIVE FEEDBACK FROM ALL 4 STUDENTS ON ALMOST ALL ASPECTS OF THE PLACEMENT

“We were given independence from the first day, this increased as the placement progressed but I always felt supported. Having a consistent caseload to see meant I was able to see a child from referral to discharge. A shared hard drive with templates and example reports was helpful.”

“I spoke to the SENCO at the end of every day, as well as most of the classroom teachers. We attended LSA and staff meetings throughout.”

IMPROVEMENTS REQUESTED

Longer placement (15-20 days instead of 10)
Online record keeping system needed
More electronic therapy resources in shared drive
Fewer room changes (4.8 hours of placement time was spent moving rooms)
Learn about TOMs earlier in placement (than ½ term)
TIME AND COST ANALYSIS

*All figures are approximate and should be considered as a rough guide only*

Time and cost estimates for Value Talking (VT) placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT placement time/cost</th>
<th>Estimated time/cost of repeating VT placement for 2 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>213 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost measured in hours of company time</td>
<td>£10,412 (minus income from RCSLT minor grant, Crowdfunding, student, tariffs, school donations £2164) = £8247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost measured in lost salary of same period in previous years</td>
<td>£2640 (lower figure as much work was put in out of hours to enable paid work during day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student tariff of £834 covered 10-32% of costs

Estimated time it would take to set up & run ANY placement (1 day per week for 10 weeks) based on the time it took us to undertake all essential placement tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK (times in hours)</th>
<th>NEW PLACEMENT</th>
<th>SUBSEQUENT PLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-PLACEMENT (register as placement provider, placement educator training, student info pack, risk assessment, comms with Uni &amp; students, planning)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACEMENT (supervision &amp; feedback, resource provision, student reports, admin, clinical tutor liaison)</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-PLACEMENT (attending PE meetings, invoicing Uni)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>90.25</td>
<td>77.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW DID STUDENTS SPEND THEIR TIME?
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OTHER RESULTS

9 hours were required for SLT to pack/unpack/drive suitcase of resources & files to schools for students every week.

Students spent 4.8 hours of placement time moving rooms at the request of school staff. Moves took 10 to 35 mins each day of placement.

DNA rate 4% (child absent/busy)

An unforeseen inability to access the locked Hampshire Schools WiFi or generate a hotspot was a barrier to accessing resources; emails & VT shared drive. It necessitated many hours of workaround time for SLT & students & increased print costs.
The numbers are small and the data may not be reliable – it’s a robust evaluation, not a double-blind RCT. However, data suggests there was a positive impact on 78% of children. Families valued the service. I believe a longer placement would generate better outcomes. Either 2 terms, or 2 days per week for a term.

Most school staff valued the service. With a longer placement more staff - student collaboration could take place & increase the impact on staff.

A successful & satisfying project

Not financially viable unless we charge schools & request parent donations. SLT income reduced by approx 1 month salary.

Students valued the placement & peer placements worked well

We’ve generated some approximate data on time required to set up & run a 2-student placement. Particularly useful in the independent sector where often one SLT assumes the roles of service manager, placement co-ordinator, placement educator, and possibly administrator as well.

Longer placements may be more cost effective

The cost of 2 students supervised by specialist SLT = (approx) cost of 1 specialist SLT for 1/3 less time
WE WOULD MAKE THE FOLLOWING CHANGES IN A REPEAT PROJECT

Longer placement & compare TOMs & other data with this study

Digital record keeping

1 room change per day & WiFi access should be core criteria for schools wishing to take part

QUESTIONS REMAINING

‘Catch Up’ funding (post-Covid) can be used for SLT – an opportunity?

If we cost our company time at £50 per hour, the cost to a school for 1 day/week for a term would be £4302, after student tariff and estimated parent donations. Is this something schools/school groups want to commission?

Is this affordable in the current financial climate?

Can we safely place students in school from January (?Covid) – would a remote service work?

Could we explore this as an option as part of a SLT degree apprenticeship if we partner with another organisation with limited SLT service to schools?
We’re interested in hearing from HEIs who have final year students living around Hampshire, to collaborate with and take this ‘student-delivered’ service to the next level. Perhaps a funded PhD?

Please get in touch & follow us on Twitter for updates

Thank you to Natalie Goh, Nimra Khan, Rachel Harrison, Kerrie Paskell (students) and the 2 primary schools, their Headteachers and SENCOs for making it work.
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