SEND Workshop Meeting

Summary Notes for Circulation

Thank you to everyone who attended the SEND workshop and shared their experiences, concerns and suggestions for reform.

The workshop was a really useful opportunity for me to hear directly from families about their experiences of the SEND system, both where support is working well and where things need to improve.

There were some clear themes throughout the discussion, particularly around getting the right support in place at the right time, improving communication and continuity for families, and making sure appropriate provision is available closer to home.

What also came through clearly was that every child and young person is different. Their individual needs and circumstances must be properly understood when decisions are made about the support and provision that is right for them.

I would like to thank everyone who came along and spoke so openly about their experiences. I will take the points raised at the workshop back to Westminster with me and make sure they form part of my ongoing work on SEND.

To help capture the breadth of the discussion, the feedback from the workshop has been grouped into the six themes discussed at the workshop.

Theme	Positive comments	Areas for improvement	Total
The Current EHCP System and the Proposed Move to ISPs	21	75	**96**
Mainstream Availability and Suitability	15	103	**118**
Availability and Suitability of Transport	5	28	**33**
Early Years Access and Intervention	8	43	**51**
Post-16 Education	4	26	**30**
The Current SEND System	5	49	**54**
Total	**58**	**324**	**382**

1. The Current EHCP System and the Proposed Move to ISPs

Families spoke positively about Education, Health and Care Plans where they are in place and working effectively. In particular, participants valued the legal protections associated with an EHCP, including the ability to challenge decisions and appeal to an independent tribunal.

However, there was considerable frustration with the process surrounding EHCPs. Families described lengthy waits, missed or ineffective reviews, frequent changes of caseworker and poor communication. Some parents felt they had been required to develop a detailed understanding of SEND law themselves in order to secure the support their child needed.

There was also significant concern about proposals to move towards Individual Support Plans, particularly where families believed this could weaken existing rights of review or appeal.

Key points raised

- Retain meaningful legal rights of appeal and access to an independent tribunal.
- Ensure local authorities meet statutory EHCP timescales and are held accountable where they do not.
- Provide families with greater continuity through a consistent and appropriately trained caseworker.
- Make EHCPs clearer, shorter and more practical for families and professionals to use.
- Ensure SEND funding reaches the children and services for which it is intended.

2. Mainstream Availability and Suitability

Participants frequently spoke positively about individual members of school staff. Educational psychologists, teaching assistants and Special Educational Needs Coordinators were among those praised for the commitment and additional support they provide. At the same time, families felt that many mainstream schools do not currently have the funding, staffing, training or facilities required to meet the full range of SEND needs.

Participants stressed that children with different needs may require very different forms of support. There was concern that provision can sometimes group pupils together without sufficiently recognising those differences.

Several points raised that mainstream education will not be the most appropriate setting for every child. They felt that successful inclusion should mean finding the environment in which an individual child can learn and thrive, rather than assuming that one type of setting will work for everyone.

Key points raised

- Improve specialist SEND training and support for teaching assistants, SENCOs and other school staff.
- Ensure provision recognises the different needs of children, including those with autism, ADHD and social, emotional and mental health needs.
- Develop more provision between conventional mainstream and specialist education for children whose needs are not well served by either.
- Ensure decisions about placements are led by the individual needs of the child.
- Consider class sizes and adult to child ratios when determining how schools with significant SEND needs are resourced.

3. Availability and Suitability of Transport

Some families reported very positive experiences of SEND transport, particularly where children had a familiar driver, appropriate support and a reliable routine. Others described difficulties with eligibility, long journeys to specialist settings and uncertainty when moving into post 16 education. Participants felt that transport decisions did not always sufficiently reflect the needs of the individual child.

The distance some pupils travel to reach an appropriate placement was also highlighted as evidence of the shortage of suitable specialist provision closer to home.

Key points raised

- Ensure transport decisions properly reflect a child's individual needs and circumstances.
- Review the availability of transport support for young people moving into post 16 education.
- Increase the availability of suitable local specialist places, reducing the need for lengthy journeys.
- Ensure drivers and escorts receive appropriate training, including safeguarding training.
- Make transport applications and eligibility decisions simpler and easier for families to understand.

4. Early Years Access and Intervention

The importance of identifying additional needs as early as possible was a strong theme throughout the discussion. Many described differing experiences depending on the professionals they encountered during a child's early years. Participants raised concerns about long waits for assessments and a lack of understanding of masking, particularly among girls.

There was also concern about gaps in support while families wait for a formal diagnosis or assessment. Participants argued that children should be able to receive appropriate help based on their needs without having to wait for the conclusion of a lengthy diagnostic process. The more flexible and child led approach found in some early year's settings were viewed positively, particularly where staff had received appropriate training.

Key points raised

- Improve training for GPs, health visitors and early years staff so that additional needs can be recognised sooner.
- Improve professional understanding of masking and the different ways SEND can present in individual children.
- Reduce assessment waiting times while ensuring families can access appropriate support during the waiting period.
- Improve transitions between early years settings, Reception and Year 1.
- Ensure families can access practical and, where appropriate, face to face support within their communities.

5. Post 16 Education

The transition from school into post 16 education was described by a few participants as particularly difficult. Numerous reports that support and transport can become harder to access at the same time as suitable educational provision becomes more limited. Where an appropriate course is available the distance from home, transport can become a significant additional barrier.

Participants also raised concerns about the transparency of decisions made by colleges where they believe a young person's needs cannot be met.

By contrast, families who experienced continuity of professional support during the transition into adulthood said this could make a substantial difference.

Key points raised

- Ensure support for young people with SEND is determined by their needs and reflects the existing statutory framework up to the age of 25 where applicable.
- Expand suitable local post 16 provision.
- Review transport arrangements for young people continuing in education after 16.
- Ensure decisions about whether a college can meet a young person's needs are clear and transparent.
- Improve continuity between children's and adult services.

6. The Current SEND System

The overall message from the workshop was that participants value the protections available within the existing SEND framework but too often struggle to secure the support those protections are intended to provide.

Participants described difficulties including frequent changes of caseworker and concerns that financial pressures can influence decisions about provision.

Alternative provision and specialist settings were highly valued by families who had found placements that worked well for their children.

There was also a strong view that SEND reform cannot be considered separately from the wider education system. Participants highlighted school accountability, the curriculum, staffing and the way educational success is measured as issues that can directly affect children with SEND.

Key points raised

- Strengthen accountability so that existing legal duties towards children with SEND are consistently met.
- Improve caseworker continuity and communication with families.
- Protect effective alternative provision and specialist settings, including not for profit providers.
- Consider SEND reform alongside wider questions about school accountability, inspection, staffing and the curriculum.

Conclusion

The workshop demonstrated both the dedication of many people working within SEND services and the considerable pressures experienced by children, young people and their families.

Across all six themes, several messages were particularly consistent: families want earlier support, clearer communication, greater continuity, suitable provision closer to home and confidence that existing rights will be upheld.

Above all, participants wanted a SEND system built around the individual needs of each child or young person, with families able to spend less time navigating processes and more time supporting their children.

Appendix: Full List of Comments by Theme

The following is the record of comments made at the meeting, grouped by theme and by whether they were raised as a positive or a concern.

Theme 1: The Current EHCP System and the Proposed Move to ISPs

Positive (21)

- Now has EHCP and is happy at school communication is good
- EHCPs provide legal protection for young people with SEN and the right to appeal is essential
- The EHCP allows for review and budget to decide on.
- Annual reviews are positive
- Appeals process
- Tribunal process
- Parental views of school placements
- Parents views are included in EHCP
- A good caseworker makes the difference
- Tribunals are good
- It works well when parents are listened to and understood
- Tribunal is good and gives opportunity to challenge and fight decisions
- Anyone can apply for an EHCP
- There are systems in place when things go wrong and the early reviews help
- The right to appeal
- The lawful protection for EHCP
- EHCP would work well if it actually did their job
- Once awarded an EHCP works
- The parents have legal protections
- School have to deliver the provision
- When they work, they bring everything together

Areas for improvement (75)

- The white paper promotes this removal of the right to review and budget decisions.
- Needs LED Process
- LA's currently knowingly breaking the law and not being held to account
- LA internal policies which don't fit current SEN law
- Schools are consulted on DRAFT EHCP – prior to parent amendments
- No support to use tribunal services
- Forcing schools to stretch "best endeavours rules"
- Mainstream ignore EHCP
- Long delays between appealing for an EHCP and issue
- Review overdue and just get automated response
- Specialist and trained staff not untrained newbies
- New proposal has much less options for appeal
- Underfunding in school is pushing parents to EHCP, which the overloaded LA
- Trying to contact LA to discuss case is impossible and stonewalled

- Burden of proof is put upon parents – We have to become experts to stand a chance
- So hard to get EHCP (time taken)
- Not always fit for purpose
- Budget is too low and finance driven
- SAR's taking over a year to get
- LA's need to do their jobs
- Stop gaslighting parents
- Funding SEN Schools
- Conflict between SEN and mental health support
- No definitions of what complex needs means
- Mainstream schools may not be ready, funded, or trained
- When is “most complex” needs not agreed?
- No EHCP = no money funding
- Can call for early reviews now – unsure if this will continue
- Annual reviews are a waste of everyone's time – family, council. Teachers
- Diagnosis LED? Not needs lead
- Lack of signposts for parent to gain support
- EHCP timescale not sticking to
- EHCP don't reflect child need
- Needs not being met at mainstream
- Assigned caseworker for EHCP
- Caseworkers lack of understand of child's needs
- School staff lack of understanding of how SEND system works
- Too big a gap between school anxiety of starting new school
- Not meeting statutory review
- Too long to allocate school don't stick to deadlines
- Takes too long to get EHCP
- Long tribunal process
- The 0-25 team 'panel'
- EHCP process too hard to access and takes too long
- Automatic recline of EHCP at the start
- Money should be ringfenced
- No annual reviews are complicated tick box
- Schools don't put in the provision
- Ping-pong between LA and Schools
- Long delays and lost time out of education
- Too complicated
- Little or no communication throughout the process
- Dates for transfer for primary, secondary and post-16 not being met
- Annual reviews are not consistently happening or happening too late for transitions
- EHCP process to be 20 weeks most exceed 52 weeks too long
- Gatekeeping of EHCNA when they meet the legal threshold
- EHCP's way too wordy and complicated, time consuming and repetitive

- EHCP wait times for agreements, completion and review
- Local authority, delaying tactics to save budget
- Local authority caseworkers
- Unprofessional, disingenuous
- Finance driven placement by LA
- SEN budget at county level
- Academy SEN department claiming to apply for SNE for child but for capable
- Not enough specialist staffing and speech therapy, physio, MSK
- Who holds school to account when they don't provide section F provision?
- There needs to be an independent decision maker and not the council or school (as proposedly the white paper).
- Not having allocated worker
- Less family voice, less ability to change and influence
- Catchment based to reduce choice – no parent choice
- Removal legal protection rights (EHCP gives legal rights)
- Wait time too long for EHCP
- Assessment timetables
- Academies not handling SEN
- Forced inclusion of emotionally vulnerable SEN children

Theme 2: Mainstream Availability and Suitability

Positive (15)

- There are many staff who care and want to help and support children
- Educational psychologists are supportive, professional and superb connection with children
- Many Tas at mainstream are doing their upmost in schools who are not providing SEN to all
- SEN focusing on early intervention and advocating for SEN parents
- EHCP have been a legally protected document that supports need.
- Protect high need funding
- Mainstream school was prepared to do almost anything to support his return
- Child's named school he has a great support from his TA and is a lot happier
- Staff having appropriate training and support and who are passionate about SEND needs.
- Needing a middle ground school for those not suitable for mainstream or specialist
- deaf primary school works well for inclusion
- primary school SEND mainstream is better
- Some specialist settings are critical for children and young people's lives
- Senco's do really want to help but often powerless
- Consistent and specialist

Areas for improvement (103)

- Substitute teachers covering need to read SEN kids files
- Teacher training is lacking
- TA's and teachers need much more education
- We need more schools' mainstream senior schools, special education senior school.
- Mainstream provision woefully underfunded and lacking consistency

- Schools still based on Victorian version of education
- The removal for flexibility for individual SEND support
- Mix SEND and behaviours in hubs
- Specific types of hubs needed for hubs ADHD, autism, SEMH all need to be separate
- Being included in mainstream means punishment
- Support in smaller councils can mean favouritism
- Provision not being safe and children are having to create their own provision
- Lots of talk but support not followed through
- Intervention spaces and hubs are used for both SEND and behaviour, they are very different needs and cannot be mixed
- Focus on attendance is eroding the SEND system and is destroying the school/family relationship
- Mainstream is not necessarily the right choice for all young people
- Academizing school turns education into a business
- Children fall off a cliff at 16 and again at 18
- OFSTED targets restrict inclusion through rigid targets and date led goals
- Not enough specialist setting and places
- SEND provision in mainstream is non-existent and not appropriate
- Mainstream is not included
- This is a band aid, without overarching the education system, the SEND system will fall
- Lack of quality training
- What does effective inclusion mean? It needs to be what the child needs
- The transition into adult social care from education is poor
- Mainstreams choose to fight the wrong battles such as reasonable adjustments
- Families having to compromise between specialist or mainstream if their child sits in-between
- If you are going to separate pupils within mainstream or those with, SEND and those without, how is that inclusive?
- Schools that say they can meet needs aren't being considered due to financial reasons.
- Needing more trained SEND Tas
- Not able to meet needs in mainstream, lack of training and capacity
- Not inclusive
- Not included in school activities such as school trips
- Scrap national curriculum
- No accountability because of academic status
- Mainstream needs a huge injection of money, education is not a priority in the UK
- The SEND budget is not ringfenced to enable SEND kids
- No access to reduced timetables
- Need a uniform policy that is accessible for all
- Access to small class sizes
- Proactive approach
- Support not punishment
- Understanding of deregulation
- Inclusion is hard to put in place because the whole education system is not fit for purpose if needed entirely overhauled
- No understanding of SEND

- Staff not trained, The Senco for 2,000 trained on the job! Actually, a NQT in a massive school
- Inclusion would be good if staff were trained, there was funding, but ultimately the whole curriculum is a failure
- Need smaller classes
- Need a higher adult to child ratio
- Need more schools
- Need different learning environment
- Need schools to be nurturing and supportive not focused on attendance and attainment
- Child's needs not being met in 2 mainstream primary schools, the only place the child's needs have been met is at an alternative provision
- Primary schools are more play-based, secondary is more like joining the army, huge shock for many
- I don't think inclusion works
- Training and the need for specialist support
- The current local mainstream offer is not enough to meet SEN needs.
- More knowledge and skills to identify needs before our breakdowns occur
- Not enough training to staff to effectively support SEN children or make it inclusive
- Inclusion is a meaningful choice but is currently not happening in mainstream due to lack of knowledge, training, funding, space and time
- Specialist resources in mainstream often have the least skilled staff, many mainstream staff have an outdated understanding and vies of SEND
- Lack of specialist staff available across the sector both SRB and Mainstream
- Current mainstream school offer is a 'sausage factory' focused on ticking attendance and attainment boxes, it needs to be child focused
- Post-16 provision being closed to bring in more early intervention, lack of SEN schools providing hubs.
- Mainstream support isn't working, mainstream classes in crisis hub state being added to mainstreams school, untrained teachers.
- Not enough trained staff, not paid enough
- Children segregated and a lot of children sit in silence and suffer. Needs unmet.
- EHCP funding profound needs (needing categories)
- ISP – not as legally binding, cutting back on EHCP
- Protect all those with behaviour, emotional, social, trauma, physical disability failings in annual review, incorrect information and reports.
- Schools saying needs met when not.
- Mainstreams adhere that meet need for funding but don't have resources or trained staff
- Needs SEN trained (more Staff)
- Academy schools needing to be inclusive not just ticking boxes
- Moving children who are non-verbal, still in nappies to inappropriate settings
- Post 16 SEN, where do they go?
- Lack of safeguarding in mainstream
- Sensory challenges regarding uniform not being catered for
- Why is mainstream the pinnacle of inclusion?
- Gaps in staffing, resources, spaces, levels of training, input from OT ISLT IEP
- Inclusion doesn't mean attending a school, it means being included in education
- Mainstream cannot be fully inclusive for those with complex needs.
- Attendance over quality of education

- Local mainstream can't cope now due to lack of funding, knowledge and skills
- Lack of training on NDT
- Gaps in staffing – vast difference in ability in learning support – minimum wage, not training, variable ability.
- Mainstreams are not able to meet needs, yet are forced toward them, even when they turn it down
- Budget doesn't reflect actual cost (funding won't cover 1:1 TA)
- Need versus staffing ability is worse every year
- EHCP reviews – often very out of date information, not accurate reflection of need
- Mainstream cannot be fully inclusive due to OFSTED inspections and environmental requirements
- Mainstream settings particularly academies – believe they deliver SEND
- Academy SEN do not understand SEN
- Inclusion is carried out by class and building not educational delivery
- Academy staff gaslighting parents into being at fault if your child doesn't fit
- Experience teachers/headteachers do not understand SEND and do not believe in it. Less experienced teachers/headteachers often have a better understanding – more wider training needed
- The range of TA and SENDCO varies widely. The whole paper putting the division on the schools will make this worse
- Schools need to focus the needs of the individual child not making all kids the same. School does not offer the range of support needed
- Elected home learning is often not chosen. Parents come to this to safeguard and protect their children who are not coping.
- The mainstream struggles to support SEND due to the constraints of teaching processes and OFSTED. So, they are not able to support SEND needs
- Pastoral support is so varied and access to is vastly different between schools
- Regulate teaching assistants to some way for training, pay and ability

Theme 3: Availability and Suitability of Transport

Positive (5)

- Our experience of transport has been good, and we are very grateful that our child has transport to school this year although this may change when they are over 16
- Will improve transport when children are moved to mainstream, private transport available for profound needs but not enough
- SEN school specialist provision, excellent service with the same driver
- Its meeting an essential need
- Home to school transport has been the only part of our journey that was east

Areas for improvement (28)

- Routes and pickups based on funding – petrol not the need of the child
- Transport is not paid enough – enabler for what they do. Child on disability bus elopes and is SMI, safeguarding is slow to act
- Lack of funding
- Transport is separate department
- Transport law changes at 16 this fails children
- Parental preference of school can mean child loses transport
- A child taken out of given provision due to lack of suitability, means that transport was lost as out of catchment
- Under new system transport to mainstream won't exist

- The local authority has rules and regulations to cover transport provision
- Parents not aware of eligibility of transport
- Poor transport policies, parents only paid for journeys child is in the car if have a personal travel budget
- Not consistent
- Lack of support and training for drivers
- No post-16 transport
- Told that the council would provide a place for a child in a specialist provision if they forfeited transport
- Told that if they got their first-choice provision, transport would not be included
- Transport times due to location of schools
- Form filling – more barriers for already exhausted parents made to feel like their scroungers for just wanting their child to be educated
- In an ideal world – kids should be educated within their own town
- All forms just make you want to give up
- Lack of minibuses/buses, taxis are expensive
- Not enough specialist provision meaning children are pushed further and further away
- Transport needed as schools are 20+ miles away
- Transport is only provided within catchment area
- Travel lines are too long to specialist schools as they are not local, named school is 50 mins each way. In a minibus with 5 other children is not suitable.
- Post-16 no transport, meaning lost hours for parents driving back and forth from the only suitable provision, affecting ability to support other children within the family unit.
- Lack of communication between transport team and families
- Very high costs and can vary drastically £30K - £80K

Theme 4: Early Years Access and Intervention

Positive (8)

- Depends on different professionals and knowledge and person experiences if it is picked up early
- Nursery picked it up but was living outside of England at the time
- Some staff within their constraints are fantastic
- EYFS is more child-led and flexible and more able to meet SEN needs
- Nursery plus nurses pick up in play group only if there is a child in class is identified
- Schools put welfare first it works well
- When primary school identifies a need and works with the special school to meet need, they need to be open to adopt and change for the child
- New parent hub staff are excellent if they can be accessed

Areas for improvement (43)

- Families having to self-fund assessments due to lack of support from Devon and Schools
- It's all well and good the while paper promising early intervention and inclusion for under 5s. but what if things become apparent later on. This is concentrating on the severe and not middle ones, who do not need specialist provision.
- Schools can only spot and meet need if they themselves are educated in what to sport. Masking especially amongst girls is massive and there needs to be an understanding around this
- Too many hoops to jump through, professionals to tick. By the time the young person and family get the support they need, it's too late

- Psychologists to make ineffective assessment there is a need to build relations for the child to feel comfortable and safe to respond to them. If a child doesn't engage within 2-3 sessions, they simply don't complete the assessment
- Ping pong between services
- Lack of funding for early years and antenatal
- The voice of the parent is rarely heard
- Children centres were crucial – the new spaces are only online
- School ready – based on targets (driven by phonics and SATs data) this is not school ready
- Either a lack of signposting or too much signposting
- Fewer community groups such as toddler groups means less support available
- Health visitors need more training
- GPs need more training
- Nursery Staff need more training
- Early years staff need to be more skilled in spotting SEN early. Especially girls who mask
- Lack of specialist knowledge in staff
- No help whilst child is awaiting diagnosis
- Masking children without obvious need is ignored and failed
- Educational staff were not trained to spot genuine need
- SEN needs picked up by parents not professionals
- Transition from early years to reception is difficult as a lack of flexibility, communication and general routine
- Switch to national curriculum in Year 1 is often when the wheels fall off for a SEN child
- Needs are only met (attempted) after diagnosis
- Mainstream environment can make or break a child after early years
- Nursery have been unhelpful with a local of help. Inconsistency between what they say the child has needs and then not.
- You don't get support after diagnosis it's a completely separate process
- Takes too long to get assessed
- Not only listens when you raise concerns
- Waiting lists are too long, waiting nearly 3 years for an ASD assessment
- Poor transition between early years and reception
- HVS don't understand and recognise a range of needs such as autism and ADHD in young children when there are commonly occurring issues
- Lacked skilled staff in EYFS and into school mean that children's needs are often ignored and left until later in a hope that 'things' will improve, but they just progressively declined
- GP not listening to parents concerned about early signs of babies having neurodiversity
- Parent identified the son as being 'different' at age 2, explained the difference to the health visitor and they were no investigations made until aged 12
- Reduced hours due to provision not being able to meet need
- No help whilst waiting for assessment, which took over a year
- Schools do not recognise or cater to trauma
- SENCO are rubbish depends on who you get, not enough qualifications to become a SEN worker
- Child sent home loads of times sick to remove him from the setting, when they weren't sick at all
- They don't record meetings or anything
- They hide behind things and gaslight you into thinking you are crazy

- Mainstream try first, lost three key stages of education, they get behind become traumatised

Theme 5: Post-16 Education

Positive (4)

- Identifying if there are needs picked up its great
- Child voice is heard
- Adult transition services – social worker was a student and did a thorough report and still supporting 6 months later
- Protect 16-25 keep EHCP going need does not disappear in post-16

Areas for improvement (26)

- Post-16 provision mainstreams to not enough provision post-16 SEN
- Older children non-verbal severe needs there is much uncertainty
- Lack of educational services, speech and language OT, emotional, and social support.
- Focusing more on early intervention takes post-16 resources away
- People aren't being paid enough for these job roles
- Not enough options for post-16
- Not enough options for cognitively able post-16 with SEN needs
- More options needed
- More places to provide options
- Options should relate to what is locally available for work
- Less guidance post-16 so feels like they have fewer rights
- Lack of support for employment
- Less options for course post-16
- Post-16 college don't have to allow a child on a course and use excuses not to allow students to attend but won't say "can't meet need"
- Provision isn't suitable post-16 accessible for 19+ age range who haven't been able to manage to get the typical education journey
- Post-16 feels like a cliff edge- even less support
- Ultimately it is about need not age
- Some students need to stay in specialist setting to do GCSEs until older, not about age it’s about ability
- There is very little post-16 provision locally, so children need to access provision that's right for them regardless of location. Including need for transport
- Not enough post-16 provision
- Children who miss school/are out of school have fewer choices at post-19 as they may not be able to access 16-18 courses
- Post school SEND work/education support – lifelong support would be good
- Terrible post-16 options
- Post-16 is challenging especially if subjects are not taught in local provision
- Problem is so many kids are let down through their education = becoming NEET
- Kids aren't supported in access to post-16

Theme 6: The Current SEND System

Positive (5)

- Local authority funded school provided fantastic education and school support
- ISP could lead to more quick access to support and funding
- Tribunal process must be kept with the right to appeal decisions
- Alternative Provisions are incredible and need to stay. "X" teams are outstanding and supportive. More of this provision is required for the children unable to manage a typical school
- Local support from "X" team has been so helpful

Areas for improvement (49)

- Cannot meet EHCP need. They have huge numbers and do not have the staff to safely care for these students
- Schools and alternative provisions need to work collaboratively to support those with SEN
- Council are not following the law, with regards to suitable provisions for those unable to attend school and have SEN
- DCC not adhering to the section 19 duty
- Parents and families being penalised for non-attendance due to SEN needs not being met
- Contemplating leaving work to care for their children who are struggling at school
- Child's EHCP draft was changed to home therapies as mainstream could not deal with these.
- Time frame and deadlines and communication
- Child is being penalised for doing therapy in school time, which is not fair
- Consistent caseworker needed 6 different caseworkers in 1 year
- Overarching increase in power of the LA over named education, infringers and rights to privacy
- DCC avoiding wording and provision with EHCPs – due to budget and lacking resources
- OFSTED couldn't be further from understanding age-appropriate development in a flexible manner
- Currently schools do not provide provisions when challenged with the LA they do not care. The White Paper will only make it worse
- Decisions being made on the need of the child – aren't
- Caseworkers should go to the panels
- Processes and timelines adhered to and being accommodated if not
- Routes for families to follow if not happy with support
- Don't move children who have hard won places in schools/ settings and are happy
- Faster process needed
- Better communication needed
- Child led – what they need, rather than economical
- Not for profit SEN provisions needed
- Specialist SEN provisional is so expensive. No wonder Las try to avoid them, can they be not-for-profit
- Parent's legal rights need to be protected. Children need protecting.
- LA being unable to cope with demand
- Timescales not being met
- Better communication is needed
- Inclusive support – stop relying on tribunals
- Essential to have a range of provisions which includes alternative provision such as "X"
- SEND System needs review, yes but the school system is broken too. It won't cope without major overhaul and investment
- Nursery not passing info to primary, so process starts again – waste of time

- Trapped in the maths/English failure can't get past C grade but have other useless qualifications, RE, French and Stuff
- No funded dyslexia assessments at primary level
- Right to appeal needs to be protected
- You have to remove provisions for your young person to transition from specialist to mainstream
- Current system has legal framework – just not being upheld
- New system has even less legal framework for parents
- LA's breaking the law by rejection EHCP requests as default. 98% of appeals are upheld
- Legal rights must be protected at all costs
- All post-16 provisions are in Exeter or Bicton no transport without an EHCP
- Government is the problem
- Most SENCOs are overworked and off sick
- The modern education system is traumatising our children
- Need an independent ombudsman to oversee that schools+ LAs are fulfilling their legal duties
- East Devon provision seems to be limited
- Parents are not believed when they raise concerns.
- Parents early concerns are ignored or played down
- Bring in more relaxed national curriculum with fewer exams