

Evidence-before-inference school judgement record

A two-page record for assessment, SEND and school decisions. Use a possible bias as a question about process, not as a diagnosis of a person.

Boundary: this record supports transparent judgement. It does not replace professional assessment, statutory duties, reasonable adjustments, family or learner voice, or the school's safeguarding route.

1. Decision, goal and consequence

Decision or judgement to be made

Who is affected and how?

Stated goal, rule or criterion

Why is this criterion valid for this decision?

Consequence

☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Time frame

Decision by:

Review

Review on:

2. Evidence and access

Source, work or observation	Period and setting	What it shows	What it cannot show

Access check:

☐ Communication route ☐ EAL meaning ☐ Sensory or motor access ☐ Assessment conditions ☐ Reasonable adjustment ☐ Learner voice ☐ Family voice ☐ Relevant context recorded without treating identity as an error

3. First judgement and confidence

Initial judgement

Confidence and reason

☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

What evidence would change this judgement?

4. Process risks to test

☐ Early value or label is anchoring the decision ☐ Vivid recent event is replacing the longer record ☐ Supporting evidence is easier to find than a challenge ☐ One feature is colouring the whole judgement ☐ Context or access is underweighted ☐ Past cost is driving the next choice ☐ Outcome is replacing process quality ☐ Other:

Compare, decide and review

Write an alternative account before naming a bias. A different account may fit better, or the evidence may remain uncertain. Disagreement is not proof of denial, confirmation bias or lack of insight.

5. Alternative account and independent check

Plausible alternative account

Evidence that supports it

Independent reviewer or second method

Difference from first view

If views differ, what may explain the gap?

6. Safeguarding and statutory boundary

- ☐ No safeguarding concern identified in this review ☐ Concern passed to the designated safeguarding route
☐ SEND process or specialist advice required ☐ Statutory or policy deadline checked ☐ Reasonable adjustments recorded
Do not delay action while trying to decide which cognitive bias may be present.

7. Decision record

Decision and reason

Confidence after comparison

☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Remaining uncertainty

Action owner

Action date

Who receives the decision and how?

Review date

8. Learner and family view

Offer an accessible route: talk, write, draw, point, advocate or AAC.

What is agreed? _____ What is disputed? _____

What further evidence or support was requested? _____

9. Outcome and process review

Review question	Evidence at review	Finding and next action
Did the intended action occur?		
What happened for the learner, class or school?		
Was the decision process fair and proportionate?		
What rule, evidence source or safeguard should change?		

Reviewer, date and final note
