



Department  
for Education

# **Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years**

**Government consultation response**

**June 2014**

# Contents

Introduction	6
Main changes to the new Code of Practice:	7
PART I -Main findings from children and young people’s consultation	8
Introduction	8
Summary of responses to the children’s (15 and under) consultation	8
Summary of responses to the young people’s (16-25) consultation	9
Government response	9
PART II Main findings from the autumn 2013 consultation by Code of Practice chapter	11
Summary of responses received	11
General comments on format, content and structure of the Code (Questions 1-4, 27 and 53)	13
Analysis:	13
Government response	14
Chapter 1 – Principles	15
Analysis	15
Government response	15
Chapter 2 – Impartial information, advice and support	16
Analysis	17
Government response	18
Chapter 3 – Working together across education, health and care for joint outcomes	19
Analysis	19
Government response	20
Chapter 4 – The Local Offer	21
Analysis	21
Government response	22
Chapters 5-7 – Early years providers, schools and further education	23
Analysis	23
Government response	24

Chapter 8 – Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years	26
Analysis	26
Government response	27
Chapter 9 – Education, health and care needs assessments and plans	28
Analysis	29
Assessment and Planning	29
EHC plans	30
Inclusive Schooling and Learning Difficulty Assessments guidance	30
Government response	31
Chapter 10 – Children and young people in specific circumstances	32
Analysis	32
Government response	33
Chapter 11 – Resolving disagreements	34
Analysis	34
Government response	35
Special Educational Needs regulations	36
Summary	36
Local Offer, SENCOs and arrangements for supporting children with SEN	36
Analysis	38
Government response	38
Education Health and Care Plans	40
Analysis	41
Government response	42
Personal Budgets	42
Analysis	43
Government response	43
Appeals and dispute resolution services and costs	44
Analysis	45
Government response	46

Transitional arrangements	47
Summary	47
Analysis	47
Pace of transition	48
Analysis	48
The process for transition	49
Analysis	50
Phasing the transition	51
Analysis	52
The Local Offer	52
Analysis	52
Government response	52
PART III Main findings from spring 2014 consultation on Code of Practice	54
Introduction	54
Summary of responses received	54
Summary of responses by consultation question	55
Question 1	55
Analysis	55
Government response	56
Question 2	56
Analysis	56
Government response	57
Question 3	57
Analysis	58
Government response	58
Question 4	59
Analysis	59
Government response	60
Question 5	60
Analysis	61
Government response	61
Question 6	62

Analysis	62
Government response	63
Question 7	63
Analysis	63
Government response	64
Question 8	65
Analysis	65
Government response	66
Question 9	67
Analysis	67
Government response	67
Annex A – Full list of draft regulations consulted on:	69
Annex B – Respondents to spring 2014 consultation	70
Annex C – Full list of respondents to the autumn 2013 Consultation	71

## Introduction

1. The Department launched a public consultation on a draft new 0-25 Special Educational Needs (SEN) Code of Practice and draft regulations last autumn. This consultation closed on 9 December 2013 and over 700 responses were received. Since this consultation further discussions were held with representatives of those who have to have regard to the Code<sup>1</sup>, to ensure that subsequent revisions secure maximum clarity for those who will be using it.
2. The Department held a second consultation on an amended draft of the Code of Practice in the spring of 2014, prior to it being laid before Parliament for approval in the summer. This consultation was intended to give members of the public, professionals and the voluntary sector a chance to comment on the amended draft of the Code, in particular the changes made to reflect subsequent amendments to the Children and Families Bill and on the structure, layout and accessibility of the Code, following the initial consultation.
3. This document sets out the Government's response to these public consultations. This document is divided into three parts and contains the Government's response to the following:
  - **PART I** - The consultation undertaken between 18<sup>th</sup> October and 20<sup>th</sup> December 2013 with children and young people to seek their views on the on the new reforms
  - **PART II** - The autumn consultation on the draft Code of Practice undertaken between 4<sup>th</sup> October and 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013, and
  - **PART III** - The spring 2014 final consultation on the revised Code of Practice undertaken between 16<sup>th</sup> April and 6<sup>th</sup> May 2014
4. These consultations form part of wider consultation undertaken by the Department on reforms enacted by the Children and Families Act 2014. Throughout the policy development process the Department has had a wide range of formal and informal discussions with the sector, local government, parents, children and young people on the content of the new Code of Practice.
5. The policy proposals in the Code have also been extensively debated in Parliament during the passage of the Children and Families Bill. All of this engagement has fed into the Government's response to the consultations and the new Code of Practice, to be laid before Parliament in the summer.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to section 77(1) of the Children and Families Act 2014

## Main changes to the new Code of Practice:

6. The changes to the Code of Practice take account of feedback from all three consultation exercises listed above and subsequent changes made to the Children and Families Bill<sup>2</sup> during the final stages of its passage through Parliament.
7. The main changes to the Code include: changes to legal duties, the accountability framework, the reach of the reforms and the structure and format of the document.
8. The legal duties set out in the Code of Practice have been further clarified following the consultations. This reflects concerns about an overall lack of distinction between statutory and non-statutory duties and includes greater clarity around the duties on schools, on commissioners and on local authorities in support of young people over 18.
9. The text on accountability has been strengthened to respond to concerns about accountability on schools in relation to supporting pupils without Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans and on local authorities in relation to the Local Offer. We have provided more information on responsibilities of different service providers and where to complain and seek redress and have emphasised the duty on local authorities to publish details of the action they intend to take in response to comments from children, young people and parents about their Local Offer.
10. The Code addresses concerns that there was insufficient focus on disabled children and on post-16 arrangements, particularly the transition to adulthood. There were also calls during the consultations for more explicit involvement of children and young people and their parents in the design of services, in particular the Local Offer, which we have reflected in the Code.
11. Following detailed feedback on structure and format the Code has been restructured to make it easier to navigate. New chapters have been added to separate out information for early years, schools and post-16 practitioners and on preparation for adulthood.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Children and Families Act 2014 received Royal Assent on 13 March 2014.

# **PART I -Main findings from children and young people's consultation**

## **Introduction**

12. The children and young people's consultation was made up of two separate consultations – one for children aged 15 and under and one for young people aged 16-25. We received 106 responses across both of these consultations.
13. Some of the responses were based on group discussions, so we do not know the overall number of children and young people represented by these responses. The young people's consultation generated the most responses (84) and we had 22 responses to the children's consultation.
14. To support the consultation the Department produced a set of accessible materials which sought to explain the proposed changes to the SEN system to children and young people. We encouraged people working with children and young people to use the consultation materials in any way that best supported their participation.
15. Respondents were asked a series of mostly open questions about how they would like to be involved in making decisions about their provision and support, and how local authorities and other agencies should support them to do this.
16. To analyse these free text responses we identified the key themes emerging from each question and coded the number of responses mentioning them.

## **Summary of responses to the children's (15 and under) consultation**

17. Children with SEN and disabilities (SEND) were asked about how they would like to find out about what services are available for them. Most respondents mentioned that they would like to find out this information from school or from the internet or social media. Most respondents also thought that local authorities should seek children's views and get them interested to take part in school time, for example raising issues in assemblies.
18. It was clear that respondents thought they should be involved in decisions or discussions about their support or provision, and in discussions about choices for the future. Some respondents said that they wanted a trusted adult to be involved with them, or on their behalf.
19. To support their involvement, respondents felt they needed access to all the relevant information about their entitlements, services and options for support and this information should be clear and in accessible formats. It was also important to

young people that the information came from someone they trusted.

## Summary of responses to the young people's (16-25) consultation

20. Young people felt that questionnaires and discussion groups were good ways for local authorities to seek their views on services and support. Many commented that it was important that local authorities make an effort to talk to young people and listen to their views and opinions.
21. As with children, young people were very keen to be involved throughout in discussions and decisions about their support and provision, and three quarters thought that the young person should have the final say. Many also mentioned wanting help from another person, usually a parent or social worker.
22. Respondents felt they needed access to all relevant information to enable them to make an informed decision. Respondents typically wanted information on the processes, the options/support available to them and on their rights and entitlements. Respondents also wanted information to be clear and accessible to them and to come from someone they trusted.
23. Despite clearly wanting to be involved in making decisions, young people responding had some worries about this. Some were worried that they would make the wrong decision, and some were worried about expressing their opinion. When asked what information and support they would need to make decisions without their parents, many mentioned having access to all the relevant information. However, many also said they would still want support from an advocate, or someone they knew well.
24. The majority of respondents wanted written information (including leaflets, websites emails etc) that would help them prepare for adulthood, although many also said they would want to talk to someone face to face. Again, clear and accessible information was important.

## Government response

25. Children and young people clearly want to be involved in making decisions about their individual support, as well as decisions about how support is provided locally. The requirement on local authorities to involve children and young people in discussions and decisions about their individual support, as well as about local provision, is clearly set out as a principle underlying the Code of Practice, and guidance is given throughout the Code on when, and how, local authorities should engage children and young people.
26. Recognising the importance of the transition to adulthood, there is now a separate

chapter *Preparing for Adulthood from the earliest years*, which emphasises the need to start this process as early as possible and that this should be centred around the child's or young person's own aspirations, interests and needs.

27. The new Code is clearer about the transfer of decision-making rights in connection with EHC plans from parents to young people at age 16. It is also clear that families will continue to play an important role in supporting young people and in being involved in decisions about their care.
28. We recognise that some young people will be anxious about this change, and that some will continue to want their parents to support them. The Code makes it clear that parents, or other family members or friends, can continue to support young people in making decisions, or act on their behalf, should the young person want this. Local authorities should also ensure young people have access to support from an independent skilled supporter to ensure their views are heard and acknowledged.
29. It was clear from the consultation responses that having clear, accessible and relevant information is vital in supporting children and young people to participate in these discussions. The Code makes it clear that local authorities must ensure that children, young people and parents are provided with the information, advice and support necessary to enable them to participate in discussions. The Code states that this should include accessible information about rights and entitlements, and recognises the need to give children and young people time to prepare for these discussions. It also states that where necessary, young people should be provided with support to participate in these discussions from an advocate such as a professional or family member.
30. In addition, local authorities must ensure that children and young people are provided with information and advice about their SEN or disability, and they must be able to access this information and advice separately from their parents if they wish to do so.

## PART II Main findings from the autumn 2013 consultation by Code of Practice chapter

### Summary of responses received

31. The online consultation on the draft Code, which closed on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013, received over 700 responses. A breakdown of the categories of respondents is set out below. Respondents were asked to select a category which best described the organisation that they were responding on behalf of, or that they worked within.
32. The largest single category of respondents was local authorities, followed by parent/carer and voluntary sector organisations. However, when parent/carer and representatives from parent partnership organisations are taken together they represent the largest single body of respondents. Some types of respondent, for example voluntary organisations and professional associations/unions, represent the views of significant groups of people in comparison with the numbers of individual respondents.

Type of Respondent	Responses Across Consultation	
	Count	Percentage
Local Authority:	148	21%
Parent/Carer:	90	13%
Voluntary Organisation:	78	11%
Other <sup>3</sup> :	76	11%
Parent Partnership:	73	10%
Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO):	56	8%
Professional Association/Union:	39	6%
Educational Psychologist:	37	5%

---

<sup>3</sup> Within the 'other' category, respondents identified themselves for the most part as officers/employees of local authorities responding personally, some national organisations/charities and members of the public.

Further Education Principal/Teacher:	31	4%
School Head Teacher/Teacher:	31	4%
Early Years Provider:	14	2%
Governor:	13	2%
Health Professional:	9	1%
Health Commissioner:	4	1%
Social Care Professional:	4	1%
Training/Apprenticeship Provider:	2	0%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>100%</b>

33. Respondents were asked to respond 'Yes', 'No', 'Not Sure' to the consultation questions. In addition, respondents could respond in 'free text' to the questions posed. To analyse these free text responses we identified the key themes and issues emerging from each question and coded the number of responses mentioning them. This summary reflects the most substantive views received during the consultation, namely those where over 10% of respondents to a question raised an issue or concern.

34. We have chosen to present the analysis of the consultation chapter by chapter as they appear in the new Code of Practice. It is worth noting that the chapter numbers as they appeared in the draft version of the Code on which we consulted were different to current chapter numbers. This is a result of the addition of several new chapters to address calls for greater levels of detail in some areas.

## General comments on format, content and structure of the Code (Questions 1-4, 27<sup>4</sup> and 53)

<b>1 Is it clear from the structure of the draft Code of Practice where you can find the information you need?</b>		
There were <b>535</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	288	54%
No:	183	34%
Not Sure:	64	12%

<b>2 Is the guidance clearly written and easy to understand?</b>		
There were <b>535</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	225	42%
No:	194	36%
Not Sure:	116	22%

<b>3 Are the statutory duties in the Children and Families Bill and the draft SEN regulations clearly explained?</b>		
There were <b>514</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	210	41%
No:	185	36%
Not Sure:	119	23%

### Analysis:

35. These questions asked respondents whether the draft Code of Practice was clearly written and easy to understand and whether it was clear from the structure where they could find the information they needed. The largest group of responses was 'Yes' to both these questions (54% and 42% respectively).

---

<sup>4</sup> Questions 27 and 53 were free text questions which asked the following: 'Please provide any further comments on the draft Code of Practice and please let us have your views on responding to the consultation'.

36. There were a significant number of comments (identified in over 150 responses) about the format and layout of the draft Code. Respondents commented that it needed to be easier to navigate, with paragraph numbers and key information highlighted. There was also demand for more illustrative examples of professional best practice and case studies.
37. Over 100 responses commented that the draft Code was not as accessible for children, young people and parents as they would have liked. There was a clear demand among respondents for guidance 'products' that will tailor the Code of Practice to specific audiences.
38. In response to Question 3, nearly 60% of respondents replied 'No' or 'Not Sure'. Over 70% of further education (FE) principal/teacher, parent/carer and parent partnership organisations who responded answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' to this question. This indicates a gap in knowledge at FE level (a trend also repeated in responses to Question 4 – see under Chapter 8, *Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years*) as well as a need to explain what is, and is not, statutory to all audiences.

## Government response

39. The Code has been revised so that it is easier to navigate. Each chapter starts with a summary of what it covers and sets out the relevant legislation. The key principles which apply across the Code, such as involving children, young people and parents and references to equality legislation have been moved to an early chapter which focuses on principles.
40. Content for early years, schools and further education has been moved into separate chapters, with an additional chapter focused on preparing for adulthood, to address the need to speak more clearly to different audiences.
41. Supplementary guides will be produced for young people and also for parents setting out what the Code means for them. Other web-based guides will highlight the key parts of the Code that are relevant to different groups of professionals. We will also work with partners to ensure that sources of good practice are made available to practitioners.

## Chapter 1 – Principles

<b>5 Does Chapter 1 explain clearly the purpose of the Code of Practice, who it applies to and how it applies to them?</b>		
There were <b>506</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	308	61%
No:	123	24%
Not Sure:	75	15%
<b>6 Does Chapter 2 summarise how the principles described there are reflected in the Code of Practice?</b>		
There were <b>484</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	300	62%
Not Sure:	98	20%
No:	86	18%

### Analysis

42.61% responded 'Yes', Chapter 2 does summarise how the principles described are reflected throughout the draft Code. However, around 60% of parent/carer and parent partnership organisation respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' to this question, indicating that they were not satisfied with the Principles section of the draft Code. Further analysis of responses to Question 5 shows a clear demand to emphasise up front the involvement of children and young people as a key principle.

### Government response

43. Further information and guidance on the involvement of children and young people has been included in Chapter 1, *Principles* in the revised Code of Practice. This emphasises its importance and makes clear that children and young people should be supported to express their views and participate in decisions.

## Chapter 2<sup>5</sup> – Impartial information, advice and support

<b>7 Is Chapter 3 clear about the information, advice and support young people in particular may need, and how agencies should work with them and their families?</b>		
There were <b>513</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
No:	201	39%
Yes:	193	38%
Not Sure:	119	23%

<b>8 Is it reasonable to expect local authorities to provide the advice and support specified in Section 3.3?</b>		
There were <b>512</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	312	61%
Not Sure:	119	23%
No:	81	16%

<b>9 Does the Code provide an accurate description of key working?</b>		
There were <b>481</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
No:	230	48%
Yes:	127	26%
Not Sure:	124	26%

---

<sup>5</sup> Chapter 2 *Impartial information, advice and support* was Chapter 3 in the draft Code of Practice that was consulted on.

**10 a) The ‘Independent Supporters’ described in Chapter 3 are intended to provide support for children, parents and young people through the Education, Health and Care assessment and planning process. Do you agree that this sort of support should be available to children, young people and parents if they ask for it?<sup>6</sup>**

There were **519** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	420	81%
Not Sure:	75	14%
No:	24	5%

## Analysis

44. Slightly more respondents said ‘No’ (39%) than ‘Yes’ (38%) to question 7, relating to whether the draft Code was clear about the information, advice and support young people may need and how agencies should engage with them. This was a particular concern of parents and parent partnership organisations. A significant proportion of respondents (over 80) focused on how the impartiality of the information, advice and support (IAS) services would be secured, particularly when local authorities would also be responsible for funding advocacy services.
45. The majority of respondents (61%) stated that it was reasonable to expect local authorities to provide the IAS services specified in the draft Code. However, 57 out of 122 local authority respondents answered ‘No’ or ‘Not Sure’. Respondents (particularly local authorities) raised concerns about the affordability of the IAS services.
46. A large majority of respondents (81%) welcomed the proposal that Independent Supporters should be available to help children, young people and parents if they ask for this. However, a significant proportion of respondents raised concerns about ensuring adequate availability of this type of support as well as ensuring that Independent Supporters are equipped with adequate skills and training to carry out their functions.
47. Another significant concern of parents was the proposal to transfer certain decision-making rights to young people at age 18. Some parents commented that this section implied that after 16 their views are ‘unimportant’ and were concerned

---

<sup>6</sup> 10b was a ‘free text’ question which asked respondents what might help to ensure such support is available to families who need it.

that 16 is too young to be making such important decisions alone.

48. The majority of respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' to question 9 on the accuracy of the description of 'key working'. There was significant demand for more details on how this would work in practice, who would act as key workers and securing the right level of funding and skills.

## Government response

49. We have now re-focused this chapter solely on the requirement to provide IAS services, to address concerns raised by respondents about the lack of clarity on what services local authorities are expected to provide. Accordingly, the chapter has been retitled *Impartial information, advice and support*.

50. The requirements on local authorities are now more clearly stated, and we have made it clear that local authorities should build on existing IAS services, such as parent partnership services, to deliver a discrete and easily identifiable service to meet the requirement in section 32 of the Children & Families Act 2014. This will help to address concerns about the affordability of this new requirement and overlap with existing services.

51. While the service(s) provided are not wholly independent of the local authority we have made it clearer in the Code that we expect the service(s) to be provided 'at arm's length' from the local authority and emphasised the importance of providing impartial information, advice and support.

52. A new chapter on *Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years* gives greater clarity on how the rights for young people themselves from age 16 will work and emphasises that families will continue to play a critical role in supporting a young person with SEND. It also recognises that most young people will continue to want, or need, their parents and other family members to remain involved in discussions and decisions about their future.

53. On key working, we have sought to be clearer that local authorities should adopt this approach when supporting children, young people and their parents. Rather than trying to define the different key working roles, which will differ from area to area, the revised Code sets out the main functions of key working support. In addition, we have also included links to useful resources on key working approaches.

## Chapter 3<sup>7</sup> – Working together across education, health and care for joint outcomes

<b>11 Does Chapter 4 describe clearly how the new joint commissioning arrangements will support children and young people with special educational needs?</b>		
There were <b>494</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
No:	202	41%
Not Sure:	152	31%
Yes:	140	28%

<b>12 Is the role of the Designated Health Officer described clearly?</b>		
There were <b>463</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	197	43%
Not Sure:	151	33%
No:	115	25%

### Analysis

54. 41% of respondents answered 'No' to question 11 on the clarity of new joint commissioning arrangements. However, the data show that concern was greater at a more strategic level. While nearly 70% of local authority respondents to this question answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' (83 responses), more Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) respondents answered 'Yes' to this question as opposed to 'No'.

55. Of those respondents who replied 'No' or 'Not Sure' to question 11, the primary concerns were around the need for greater and clearer information on where responsibility and accountability lie across all parties. Respondents felt that practical examples of joint commissioning arrangements could exemplify and clarify these issues. Finally, there was demand from parent and parent

---

<sup>7</sup> Chapter Three *Working together across education, health and care for joint outcomes* was Chapter Four in the draft Code of Practice that we consulted on.

partnership respondents to include parents and young people earlier in the planning cycle and at this more strategic level.

56. The largest group of respondents (43%) said 'Yes' to question 12 about whether the role of the Designated Health Officer (DHO) was described clearly. However, 58% of respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' to the question, also suggesting a further demand for increased clarity. Comments focused on securing clarity about what the DHO should, could and must do. In addition, some respondents wanted more information on how the advocacy and commissioning role of the DHO would be managed and any potential conflicts of interest avoided.

## Government response

57. To address the concerns raised by respondents on the reforms set out in this chapter the Government has taken a number of steps. The section on the DHO has been redrafted and the role renamed as the Designated Medical Officer (DMO). Many respondents thought that by allowing this role to fall to a generic health professional it would lose some of its credibility. The revised Code now suggests the role should be carried out by a paediatrician, or if not then a suitably qualified and experienced medical professional. We have also removed the reference to advocacy which many respondents thought would raise a conflict of interest between the role of DMO and the organisation in which they are based.

58. Further, we have emphasised the importance of parents, children and young people at a strategic level and suggested their insights should be used to inform commissioning decisions.

59. To respond to the request for clearer information on accountability across partners we have included a table in the revised Code, which clearly lays out which agency is responsible for what and their accountability structure. This table has received positive feedback from audience groups and the wider sector.

60. Of those who said the chapter did not clearly describe how the new joint commissioning arrangements will support children with SEN, many felt that practical examples would clarify the issue. We have not done this as to do so would be inconsistent with our approach to statutory guidance. There will, however, be useful sources of information that provide clear examples of how joint commissioning can work, such as the pathfinder information packs, and these will appear on a separate web page alongside the Code. Links to them will also be provided within the Code in the References section.

## Chapter 4<sup>8</sup> – The Local Offer

<b>13 Does Chapter 5 describe clearly the purposes of the Local Offer?</b>		
There were <b>509</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	321	63%
Not Sure:	107	21%
No:	81	16%

<b>14 Is the guidance clear about what local authorities and their partners must do to develop, publish and review the Local Offer?</b>		
There were <b>501</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	253	50%
No:	132	26%
Not Sure:	116	23%

### Analysis

61. 63% of all respondents agreed that the draft Code sets out clearly the purposes of the Local Offer and only 16% responded 'No'. Nearly 80% of local authority respondents to this question responded 'Yes'.

62. Some respondents (particularly parents and parent partnership organisations) asked for greater clarity on who was accountable for delivering the Local Offer and wanted more information on the responsibilities of different service providers. In addition, respondents sought more information on how to seek redress if the local authority is not discharging its duties in relation to the Local Offer.

63. Overall there was a net positive agreement to question 14 about whether the draft Code was clear on what local authorities must do in relation to the Local Offer. However, only 51% of respondents answered 'Yes' in comparison to 49% of respondents who answered 'No' or 'Not Sure'.

64. Within the total group of respondents, parents and parent partnership

<sup>8</sup> Chapter 4 *The Local Offer* was Chapter 5 in the draft Code of Practice that we consulted on.

organisations did not find the guidance clear. Nearly double the number of these respondents, in comparison to other groups, answered 'No' or 'Not Sure'. The majority of concerns raised by parent partnership organisations focused on how to secure the involvement of children, young people and parents in the development of the Local Offer. There were also some concerns about securing accessibility for all users, particularly for those who might not have access to the internet.

65. A smaller group of respondents raised concerns over how quality control and consistency will be ensured across different local authorities and suggested that the Government may want to consider standardising the format and presentation of the Local Offer to ensure equity of service provision.

## Government response

66. We have made sure the guidance in the Code of Practice reflects the common framework for the Local Offer set out in regulations. These regulations stipulate the information that every local authority must include in their Local Offer, eligibility criteria for access to services, how people can complain if they are unhappy about the support they get, and how they can comment about the Local Offer, including any gaps in services they would like to be filled.

67. Parliament decided not to place new legal duties on those providing services set out in the Local Offer. We want the Local Offer to be as wide and varied as possible and to include small voluntary and community sector groups on whom it would not be appropriate to place such legal duties. Many of the services will be provided or commissioned by local authorities, or provided by institutions such as schools and colleges who will already have legal duties to do their best to make sure children and young people with SEN get the help they need and be accountable for doing so.

68. We have noted calls for national minimum standards for services in the Local Offer. This issue was extensively debated in Parliament during the passage of the Children and Families Bill. Parliament decided not to go down this route as it would stifle local discussion and innovation. The Act requires local authorities to publish comments from children, young people and parents about the Local Offer, which may include their views about the quality of services and any gaps in provision, and to publish alongside those comments details of the action they intend to take in response to them. We have also linked this to the duties local authorities and their health partners have to review their provision. We believe that this will improve local accountability and help make services more responsive to local needs.

## Chapters 5-7<sup>9</sup> – Early years providers, schools and further education

<b>15 Does Chapter 6 make clear the importance of involving children, parents and young people in decision making?</b>		
There were <b>502</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	335	67%
No:	92	18%
Not Sure:	75	15%

<b>16 Is the guidance clear about what education providers should do to identify and support children and young people of different ages to achieve good outcomes?</b>		
There were <b>522</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
No:	257	49%
Yes:	165	32%
Not Sure:	100	19%

### Analysis

69. 67% of respondents answered 'Yes' to question 15 that Chapter 6 made clear the importance of involving children, parents and young people in decision-making. However, 68% of respondents responded 'No' or 'Not Sure' to question 16 on whether the draft Code was clear about what education providers should do to identify and support children and young people of different ages to achieve good outcomes. Over 80% of parent/carers, parent partnership and voluntary organisations responded 'No' or 'Not Sure' to this question.

70. The main concern across all respondents (identified in 125 responses) was that further clarification of terms might be helpful, particularly what was meant by the terms 'good outcomes', 'best endeavours' and 'adequate progress'. Parents in

---

<sup>9</sup> Chapters 5-7 *Early years providers, Schools and Further education* were all together in Chapter 6 of the draft Code of Practice we consulted on.

particular were also concerned about ensuring schools take inclusion seriously and ensuring that schools are not able to discourage applications from pupils with SEN.

71. There was also a request for more detailed guidance on when to apply specialist expertise and more guidance on putting reasonable adjustments in place. FE providers also signalled that they wanted additional guidance to support them to make good SEN provision.
72. Significant numbers of local authorities, parents, parent partnership and voluntary organisations (identified in over 60 responses) raised issues around accountability and challenge, in particular how these requirements would affect academies, free schools and independent schools outside of local authority control.
73. Some respondents raised concerns that the draft Code had too much of a 'medical' focus in relation to the 'areas of need' set out in the chapter. Responses were mixed about the benefits of including 'mental health' in any descriptors. A small number of respondents considered the use of the term 'mental' to be pejorative. Of those that did support its use, some felt that ensuring the full phrase 'mental health' was used would be better.

## Government response

74. We recognise that the approach taken to support children with SEN will be different for each educational phase. So rather than having a single chapter covering all three phases, the revised Code has been split into three distinct chapters 5, 6 and 7 (early years, schools and further education respectively). Each clearly sets out the responsibilities for the relevant sector and speaks directly to the audience for that educational phase.
75. We have revised the Code to make clearer the range of factors that a setting should consider when determining whether a child or young person has SEN. We have decided against setting out detailed central requirements on what constitutes 'good outcomes' as these will vary from child to child and setting to setting. We have also defined in general terms what 'best endeavours' means.
76. Chapter 6 of the revised Code is now more explicit about schools' responsibilities towards disabled children and those with SEN, including in respect of admissions. The duties have not changed, but we have outlined what schools must do. We have set out in the revised Code that academies (including free schools) must have regard to the Code of Practice. We have also included a new section on inclusive practice and removing barriers to learning in Chapter 1 *Principles*.
77. To address issues raised about text on the four areas of need, the revised Code

is clearer that these are simply to support identification of need rather than to be used as 'labels'. We have changed the heading from 'Social, mental and emotional health' to 'Social, emotional and mental health', but decided to retain the term 'mental health' as we feel it is important to recognise it as an issue.

78. In order to address concerns raised by FE providers and other respondents about a perceived lack of information on the duties on post-16 colleges, we have developed the FE section of the Code and separated it out into its own chapter. The FE chapter now includes clearer information about the new duties on colleges as well as greater detail on what good SEN provision looks like in FE. Specifically, we have now included a summary for FE colleges of the specific statutory duties that will apply to them, and included more detail on the support that colleges are expected to provide for students with SEN.

## Chapter 8 – Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years

4 Does the guidance provide sufficient focus on the full age range from 0-25 including early years and post-16 as well as school-age children?		
There were <b>510</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
No:	209	41%
Yes:	203	40%
Not Sure:	98	19%

### Analysis

79. This chapter was not present in the original version of the draft Code. However, it has now been included in the revised Code to address concerns raised during the consultation about the lack of information in this area.
80. 41% of respondents answered 'No' to Question 4, on whether the draft Code provided sufficient focus on the full age range from 0-25. Further education principal/teacher, voluntary organisation and parent partnership respondents were particularly negative in their responses to this question with nearly three quarters of respondents in these groups answering 'No' or 'Not Sure' (71%, 69% and 78% respectively).
81. While a significant number of respondents to this question asked for more information on early years (identified in nearly 100 responses), the largest perceived gap was around detail on post-16 onwards (identified in over 125 responses). Respondents also requested more information on the position of those aged 19-25.
82. Further education principal/teacher respondents also responded 'No' or 'Not Sure' to question 5, which asked whether the principles set out in the Code clearly explain its purpose, who it applies to and how it applies to them. For example, 64% of further education principal/teacher respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' in comparison to only 24% of local authority respondents.
83. There was also demand for greater clarity on the situation of young people without an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan at school who may need an EHC plan when they move to FE.

## Government response

84. We have added a new chapter, *Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years*, which includes significant post-16 content and addresses the concern that the Code lacked detail on post-16 provision. This chapter, like the chapter on *Further education*, includes significant new and developed content, including more information on the transition into post-16 education and on the transfer of decision-making rights to young people at the end of compulsory school age.
85. In this new chapter we have also set out key information for all post-16 institutions and practitioners on pathways to employment and more extensive guidance on the transition to adult health and social care services. We have included a new section on how local authorities, colleges and schools should work together to prepare young people with SEN as they approach the time when they will leave full-time education and/or training. This chapter also now includes guidance on raising aspirations at an early age and makes it clear that preparing for adulthood starts well before the post-16 stage of education or training.

## Chapter 9<sup>10</sup> – Education, health and care needs assessments and plans

**17 Is Chapter 7 clear about how to carry out assessment and planning for children and young people 0-25, including helping children and young people prepare for adult life?**

There were **498** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	194	39%
No:	179	36%
Not Sure:	125	25%

**18 Is the guidance clear about the importance of engaging children, young people and their parents in decision making on assessment, planning and reviews?**

There were **500** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	353	71%
No:	77	15%
Not Sure:	70	14%

**19 Is the guidance on the content of Education, Health and Care plans helpful?**

There were **485** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	260	54%
Not Sure:	125	26%
No:	100	21%

---

<sup>10</sup> Chapter 9 *Education, health and care needs assessments and plans* was Chapter 7 in the draft Code of Practice that we consulted on.

**20 Is the guidance appropriate and relevant to professionals across education, health and care?**

There were **476** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	186	39%
Not Sure:	160	34%
No:	130	27%

**21 Does the guidance adequately reflect the essential features of the *Inclusive Schooling* guidance which is being replaced?**

There were **420** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Not Sure:	192	46%
Yes:	129	31%
No:	99	24%

**22 Does the guidance cover the necessary features of the *Learning Difficulty Assessments* guidance which is being replaced?**

There were **403** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Not Sure:	196	49%
Yes:	116	29%
No:	91	23%

## Analysis

86. Overall, respondents were very positive about whether the draft Code was clear about the importance of engaging children, young people and their parents in decision-making on assessment, planning and reviews. 71% of respondents answered 'Yes' to question 18. Across the consultation, respondents replied positively to the principles of involving children, young people and their families in decisions at both a strategic (ie Local Offer) and personal level.

## Assessment and Planning

87. There was a mixed response to Question 17. While the biggest group of respondents (194) answered 'Yes', 234 respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure'

indicating a demand for greater clarity. The most common request by far (identified in nearly 70 responses) was for greater clarity around thresholds which might trigger an EHC plan. This was common across all groups of respondents. Further education principals/teachers, local authority/voluntary organisations and parent/carer respondents also emphasised the need for more clarity overall on 19-25 arrangements.

88. Another issue raised repeatedly by respondents was timescales for the EHC needs assessment process. These responses were divided, with local authorities stating that they felt the 20-week time limit was clear but challenging, whilst parents felt that 20 weeks, whilst being clear, is too long for a child to wait for provision. A number of the responses explicitly asked for timescales to be made clear at every stage of the process, as well as for plans to be reviewed annually and greater clarity on what constitutes a request for an assessment for an EHC plan.

## **EHC plans**

89. There was a mixed response to Question 20, with only 39% of all respondents answering 'Yes' and 61% answering 'No' or 'Not Sure'. Voluntary organisations and parent/carer respondents in particular answered negatively to this question (59% and 56% answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' respectively).

90. Overall, respondents were mostly concerned about the consistency and 'portability' of plans – nearly a quarter of respondents mentioned the need for a 'national template' in their written responses. There was also a demand for more clarity over outcomes, advice and resources for monitoring progress.

91. Overall respondents to Question 19 and 20 also considered that there was sufficient focus on education, but required more detail on the health and/or social care elements of EHC needs assessments and plans.

## **Inclusive Schooling and Learning Difficulty Assessments guidance**

92. In response to questions 21 and 22 the largest group of respondents answered 'Not Sure' (46% and 49% respectively).

93. Local authority, parent/carer and voluntary organisation respondents wanted more information on inclusion and for greater levels of accountability to be placed on schools. A secondary concern was around more detail on reasonable adjustments and a call to include examples of best practice in the guidance. With regard to the Learning Difficulty Assessments (LDA) guidance, respondents wanted more reflection of the transition details in the Code.

## Government response

94. We have chosen not to introduce a single national template, which some respondents advocated, as this would constrain local flexibility and creativity to design EHC plans to meet local needs. However, to address concerns about consistency we will share further best practice examples of completed EHC plans to support local areas in developing high quality plans.
95. In response to the specific request for greater clarity about the format of the EHC plan, we have introduced in the Code of Practice a common labelling system, so that every EHC plan must contain specified sections that must be labelled with the same letter. This will ensure that plans are portable when families move between local areas and that there is a common point of reference to support appeals.
96. In response to requests for great clarity on the criteria used to determine when EHC plans will be issued, we have added additional information on the factors that local authorities should take into account when deciding whether to undertake an EHC needs assessment and whether to issue an EHC plan. In response to concerns about a lack of common language around outcomes, we have added a new sub-section into the chapter, which defines what an 'outcome' is and provides advice on how to write them.
97. In order to address concerns about the lack of sufficient focus on health and social care we have provided additional guidance on how to prepare an EHC plan to make clear which health and social care needs and provision must be included. This includes an explanation of the social care services provided to disabled children under section 2 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970.
98. We have included essential features of the *Inclusive Schooling Guidance* in the Code of Practice, including examples of reasonable steps that schools, colleges and local authorities can take to include disabled children and young people in mainstream settings. The *Inclusive Schooling Guidance* was published in 2001. Since then the Equality Act 2010 has come into force, providing a new statutory framework to support equality of opportunity for disabled people. We have therefore focused the guidance more closely on the duties introduced by that framework, in the principles at the beginning of the Code of Practice and throughout the various chapters.
99. The Children and Families Act 2014 makes provision for young people with statements of SEN, to move into college and continue receiving special educational provision through an EHC plan. Previously these young people would have had an LDA at 16 (with no duty on the local authority to make the provision). The principles of the LDA guidance are reflected in the guidance on EHC needs assessments, including the involvement of young people themselves in decisions about their support and a focus on preparing for adulthood.

## Chapter 10<sup>11</sup> – Children and young people in specific circumstances

<b>23 Does Chapter 8 provide sufficient information about support to be provided for children and young people in the specific circumstances described?</b>		
There were <b>411</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	187	45%
Not Sure:	133	32%
No:	91	22%

<b>24 Are the duties of local authorities and others towards children and young people in specific circumstances explained clearly?</b>		
There were <b>414</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	207	50%
No:	109	26%
Not Sure:	98	24%

### Analysis

100. Fewer than half (45%) of respondents to question 23 agreed that there was sufficient information in the chapter about children and young people in specific circumstances. Of the local authorities who responded 55% agreed that there was sufficient information in the chapter about how to support these groups of children and young people. A greater proportion of parents/carers and voluntary sector organisations who responded felt that there was insufficient information. In particular, voluntary sector organisations who responded were the least positive on whether there was sufficient information.

101. Of the main issues raised by respondents in relation to question 23, most were concerned about looked after children (LAC) and children who are home educated. There were also a number of respondents who felt that there needed to be more information on groups that had been missed out. Other concerns focused

---

<sup>11</sup> Chapter 10 'Children and young people in specific circumstances' was Chapter Eight in the draft Code of Practice that we consulted on.

on accountability and the potential for inconsistent approaches to be followed by different local authorities.

102. In response to question 24 about whether the duties on local authorities towards children and young people in specific circumstances were clear, 50% of all respondents said 'Yes', with the remaining respondents being almost equally split between 'No', 26%, and 'Not Sure', 24%.

103. These questions generated one of the highest response rates from voluntary sector organisations across all the questions in the consultation. While the voluntary organisation respondents represented a variety of issues, as a group 81% of respondents answered 'No' or 'Not Sure' in comparison to only 39% of local authorities.

## **Government response**

104. We have made a number of changes to the guidance to further clarify the position on support for LAC. Many of the issues raised in the consultation were about the need to improve provision for particular groups of children and young people, notably looked after children, home educated children and young people, and young people in custody. The guidance in Chapter 10 and elsewhere in the Code has been made clearer about what practitioners need to consider for children and young people with SEN in these groups and what they need to take into account when planning and providing support for them.

105. We have completely rewritten the section on young offenders to reflect the amendments that were agreed during the final stages of the passage of the Children and Families Bill. These include the right for detained children and young people to request an EHC needs assessment while they are in custody and the duties on the home local authority and health service commissioners to arrange appropriate provision if a child or young person with an EHC plan is detained in custody.

## Chapter 11<sup>12</sup> – Resolving disagreements

<b>25 Does Chapter 9 provide sufficient support and information to help parents and young people understand the different routes for appeals and complaints?</b>		
There were <b>459</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	197	43%
No:	143	31%
Not Sure:	119	26%

<b>26 Is sufficient guidance given on what makes effective disagreement resolution and mediation services?</b>		
There were <b>437</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	196	45%
Not Sure:	123	28%
No:	118	27%

### Analysis

106. In response to these questions more respondents, 43% and 45% respectively answered 'Yes', the chapter provided sufficient information on routes for appeals and complaints and there was sufficient guidance on disagreement resolution and mediation in the draft Code. In both cases however, over half of respondents to the questions were either 'Not Sure' or felt that there was insufficient information and guidance on appeals and disagreement resolution services.

107. Around a third of respondents to both questions, 27% and 31% respectively, said that the draft Code did not provide sufficient information to help parents and young people understand routes for appeals, complaints and disagreement resolution services. Where respondents felt that there was insufficient information or a lack of clarity they cited a number of reasons. Many respondents felt that the appeals process was unclear and would benefit from a flow chart or diagram that set out the process from start to finish with clear timescales.

---

<sup>12</sup> Chapter 11 *Resolving disagreements* was Chapter 9 in the draft Code of Practice that we consulted on.

108. A significant proportion of respondents felt that the proposed mediation and appeals processes were too complicated and could lead to delays in decisions being made. This was a particular concern raised by local authorities and parents/carers and parent partnership organisations, but for different reasons. A significant number of respondents requested a single route of appeal for disputes on the content of EHC plans, as the suggested approach of three separate routes was too complicated and not in the spirit of the reforms. Again, local authorities, parents and parent partnership and voluntary organisations were most vocal on this point.

## **Government response**

109. To help address the calls for a single route of appeal we have widened the remit of the mediation and disagreement resolution arrangements to cover both health and social care services for those who are having needs assessments or have EHC plans. This means that there will be a single place where parents and young people can address their concerns across education, health and social care.

110. We have included text on the role of the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman to give a more comprehensive picture of complaint routes.

111. We will also, with the Ministry of Justice, be reviewing appeal and complaint arrangements for children and young people with education, health and care needs and, as part of that review, running pilots where the Tribunal will have the power to make recommendations about the health and care content of EHC plans.

112. To address concerns about the process being unclear and overly complicated we have now included two flowcharts in the revised Code. We have moved the text on local complaints procedures to the end of the chapter, again in response to the consultation, so that there is a more logical order to the chapter. We have also updated the text to take account of late changes to the Children and Families Act 2014, which widened disagreement resolution and mediation to cover the health and social care elements of EHC plans.

# Special Educational Needs regulations

## Summary

113. This section covers the all questions on the draft regulations and a draft Order (Questions 28 to 42), which support implementation of the reforms (for full list of draft regulations see Annex A). Questions on the regulations covered: implementation and delivery of the Local Offer, requirements on school SENCOs, EHC needs assessments, Personal Budgets and the reforms to appeals and disagreement resolution services.

114. In answer to almost all questions in this section over 50% of respondents agreed that the draft regulations were clear, appropriate and fit for purpose. In the instances where there was a majority of respondents answering 'No' or 'Not Sure' it was in relation to the questions on Personal Budgets and direct payments (Questions 35 and 36) and on arrangements to pilot giving children the right of appeal to the First-tier Tribunal (SEN and Disability) (Question 41).

115. Overall, there was a relatively low response rate (under 50% in almost all cases) to the questions in this section. There were also instances of high levels of 'Not Sure' responses, for example Question 41 on the pilot arrangements (61% of respondents answered 'Not Sure'). This could be a result of the technical and complex nature of the questions in this section and the fact that this set of questions is closely linked to questions raised earlier in the consultation, where views may have already been given.

## Local Offer, SENCOs and arrangements for supporting children with SEN

<b>28 Do the draft regulations set out clearly what local authorities are required to do to prepare, publish and review their Local Offer?</b>		
There were <b>374</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	229	61%
No:	85	23%
Not Sure:	60	16%

**29 Do the draft regulations set out clearly the requirements on schools in relation to the qualifications and experience, role, functions and responsibilities of their Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO)?**

There were **360** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	240	67%
Not Sure:	66	18%
No:	54	15%

**30 Do the draft regulations set out clearly what information schools are expected to publish about their arrangements for identifying, assessing and supporting children with special educational needs?**

There were **352** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	235	67%
Not Sure:	63	18%
No:	54	15%

**31 Are the draft regulations clear about the circumstances in which a child or young person without an Education, Health and Care plan may remain in a special school or special post-16 institution following an assessment of their needs?**

There were **331** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	170	51%
Not Sure:	81	24%
No:	80	24%

<b>32 Are the draft regulations clear about what should happen where a child or young person without an Education, Health and Care plan remains in a special school or special post-16 institution following a change in their circumstances?</b>		
There were <b>329</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	145	44%
Not Sure:	103	31%
No:	81	25%

## Analysis

116. Overall, the majority (50% or more) of respondents agreed that the draft regulations covering these questions were set out clearly and were fit for purpose. In response to whether the draft regulations relating to SENCOs and arrangements for supporting children with SEN (Question 29 and 30) are clear, a much higher percentage of respondents, 67% in both cases, positively endorsed the clarity of the draft regulations.

117. There was not such clear agreement to Questions 31 and 32, which asked respondents about the clarity of the draft regulations in circumstances where a child or young person without an EHC plan could remain in a special school or post-16 institution. Just over half, 51%, of respondents felt that the draft regulations were clear about when a child or young person could remain in a special school or post-16 institution following an assessment of their needs. Only 44% of respondents to Question 32 were clear about what should happen to the child or young person following a change in their circumstances, and 31% stated that they were 'Not Sure'.

118. Respondents included suggestions that the Local Offer should follow a standardised national format to ensure consistency and minimum standards – a view raised elsewhere in the consultation. Also raised was the suggestion that the Regulations should stipulate that SENCOs should be part of a school's Senior Leadership Team (SLT).

## Government response

119. The Act makes clear that the Local Offer should set out provision for disabled children and young people as well as those with SEN. Local authorities must publish comments about their Local Offer from children and young people and

parents. The regulations will make clear that local authorities must also publish what action they intend to take in response to those comments.

120. Whilst the majority of responses to the consultation felt that the draft regulations on the SEN information schools should publish were clear, a significant number were not sure or disagreed. We have therefore made some changes to clarify the information schools should publish. We have also aligned the requirements on schools to the provisions in the Local Offer so that parents will be able to see what support is expected to be available across schools in the local authority's area and find further detail about the support in a particular school under the same headings.

121. The regulations will make clear that children and young people who are admitted to a special school or special post-16 institution for an EHC needs assessment may only remain there for a period of 10 days after the local authority has informed the child's parent or the young person that it does not intend to make an EHC plan or until an EHC plan is made. We have made clear in the new Code of Practice that, when children and young people without EHC plans are admitted to a special school or special post-16 institution as a result of a change in circumstances, the local authority should immediately institute an EHC needs assessment.

## Education Health and Care Plans

<b>33 a) Education, Health and Care assessments?</b>		
There were <b>343</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	218	64%
Not Sure:	67	20%
No:	58	17%

<b>33 b) Education, Health and Care plans?</b>		
There were <b>338</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	207	61%
Not Sure:	69	20%
No:	62	18%

<b>33 c) Timescales for Education, Health and Care plans?</b>		
There were <b>355</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	258	73%
Not Sure:	55	15%
No:	42	12%

<b>33 d) The transfer of Education, Health and Care plans?</b>		
There were <b>333</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	202	61%
Not Sure:	79	24%
No:	52	16%

<b>33 e) Reviews and reassessments?</b>		
There were <b>336</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	193	57%
No:	80	24%
Not Sure:	63	19%

<b>33 f) Ceasing to maintain Education, Health and Care plans?</b>		
There were <b>335</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	209	62%
Not Sure:	71	21%
No:	55	16%

<b>34 Are the draft regulations clear about which institutions can be approved for the purposes of requests to be named in an Education, Health and Care plan and the matters the Secretary of State will take into account in giving and withdrawing his approval?</b>		
There were <b>312</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	178	57%
Not Sure:	103	33%
No:	31	10%

## **Analysis**

122. The majority of respondents (ranging from 57% at the lowest to 73% at the highest) agreed that the draft regulations on EHC plans were clear and set out the roles and responsibilities of different groups appropriately. In particular, 73% of respondents to question 33 (c) agreed that timescales were clearly set out and 62% of respondents to question 33(f) agreed that transfer and review points for EHC plans were clear.

123. One of the most common requests emerging from free text comments was for

the development of a national standard format for EHC plans to ensure greater consistency and portability. Specifically, respondents asked for greater detail on thresholds and criteria for determining whether or not a needs assessment for an EHC plan should be undertaken.

## Government response

124. In response to consultation requests for greater consistency in the format of EHC plans, the Department has amended the regulations to specify that information provided within EHC plans must be included in separately labelled sections (the labelled sections are now listed in the regulations). In response to requests for greater clarity over thresholds and criteria for EHC needs assessments, the Department has provided extra guidance for local authorities on considering whether an assessment is necessary in the Code of Practice.

125. We have addressed concerns about what institutions can be approved, as per question 34, by publishing guidance to clarify what providers need to do to apply to join the approved list.

126. A number of respondents asked why non-maintained early years providers and specialist nurseries were not included. They are not in scope of section 41 of the Act – only schools and special post-16 institutions can be approved.

## Personal Budgets

<b>35 Are the draft regulations clear about the arrangements for seeking a Personal Budget and the local authority’s duties in respect of Personal Budgets?</b>		
There were <b>355</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	140	39%
No:	114	32%
Not Sure:	101	28%

<b>36 Are the draft regulations clear on the arrangements for direct payments?</b>		
There were <b>332</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	155	47%
Not Sure:	110	33%
No:	67	20%

## Analysis

127. 60% of all respondents to question 35 answered 'No' or 'Not sure' on whether the draft regulations were clear about arrangements and local authority duties. A slightly higher proportion of respondents felt that the draft regulations on direct payments were clear (47% of respondents answered 'Yes'), however more than half responded 'No' or 'Not Sure' (32% and 28% respectively).

128. Respondents felt that the draft regulations on Personal Budgets could be simplified. One area that they felt required particular clarity were the duties on local authorities, particularly in relation to direct payments. The most common issue raised was a request for further guidance to be produced as the draft regulations were unclear and it was difficult to understand the different responsibilities for parents and local authorities.

## Government response

129. The Department has made changes and restructured the regulations to give greater clarity. We have reviewed the content in the draft Code of Practice to ensure that responsibilities are clear and the operation of Personal Budgets easier to understand.

## Appeals and dispute resolution services and costs

<b>37 Are the draft regulations clear about the circumstances in which appeals may be brought?</b>		
There were <b>329</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	223	68%
Not Sure:	60	18%
No:	46	14%

<b>38 Are the draft regulations clear about how arrangements for mediation are intended to work?</b>		
There were <b>329</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	216	66%
Not Sure:	61	19%
No:	52	16%

<b>39 b) Should there be prescribed limits and, if so, how much should they be?</b>		
There were <b>291</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Not Sure:	129	44%
Yes:	99	34%
No:	63	22%

<b>40 Does the draft Order set out reasonable arrangements for local authorities to pilot giving children the right to appeal to the Tribunal?</b>		
There were <b>288</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	146	51%
Not Sure:	121	42%
No:	21	7%

<b>41 Will this provide a sufficient basis on which to decide whether to extend the right to appeal across England?</b>		
There were <b>273</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Not Sure:	167	61%
Yes:	72	26%
No:	34	12%

## Analysis

130. Overall, a significant majority of respondents who answered questions 37 and 38 on the draft regulations in relation to the circumstances in which appeals can be brought and on how arrangements for mediation are intended to work agreed that they were clear, with 68% and 66% agreeing ‘Yes’ respectively.

131. On the issue of whether the regulations should cover ‘reasonable’ expenses the answers were more mixed. Respondents to question 39<sup>13</sup> (b) were divided on whether there should be prescribed limits to these expenses set out in Regulations. The highest majority of respondents to this question, 44%, answered ‘No’ and only 34% said ‘Yes’, limits should be prescribed in this way.

132. In respect of questions 40 and 41, which consulted on a pilot to give children the right of appeal to the Tribunal and the efficacy of using the pilot to extend this right to children across England, there was a mixed response – 51% of respondents agreed that the draft Order set out reasonable arrangements for local authorities to pilot the right of children to appeal. However, a significant proportion of respondents, 42%, were ‘Not Sure’ whether the draft Order set out reasonable arrangements. The proportion of respondents who were ‘Not Sure’ rose to 61% under Question 41<sup>14</sup>, when asked about whether the pilot would provide sufficient basis to extend the right of appeal.

133. Recurrent themes under this set of questions included requests for more guidance on how to navigate the appeals system and on the need to be clear about how health and social care appeals would be handled. On the questions about ‘reasonable costs’ many respondents shared views about home to school transport, which was not intended to be the subject of the question. Many of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Question 39a was a free text question which asked respondents what expenses they thought it would be reasonable for the Regulations to cover.

<sup>14</sup> Question 42 was a free text question which asked respondents if they had any further general comments on the draft Regulations.

respondents who answered the question about whether there should be prescribed limits, felt that these should account for personal circumstances, such as geography. On the children's appeals pilots a number of the respondents answered on the basis of the principle of giving children the right to appeal rather than the arrangements set out under the Regulations.

## Government response

134. Many of the responses to the draft appeal regulations said that there should be a single point of appeal for EHC plans. The Government, during the passage of the Children and Families Bill, introduced amendments to widen the remit of the disagreement resolution and mediation arrangements to cover health and social care provision set out in EHC plans and these amendments have been reflected in the final Regulations and the Code of Practice.
135. The Government also amended the Bill to provide for a review of redress arrangements for children and young people with SEN and the review may include pilots where the First-tier Tribunal (SEND) will be able to make recommendations about the health and social care provision set out in EHC plans.
136. In relation to the Regulations on children's right to appeal, a number of respondents questioned whether it was appropriate to give children the right to appeal. The Government has decided to go ahead with piloting children's right to appeal, the purpose of which is to decide whether this would be the right way forward.

# Transitional arrangements

## Summary

137. This section covers all questions relating to implementation of the new SEN system, specifically arrangements for transfer from statements and Learning Difficulty Assessment (LDAs) to EHC plans and introduction of the Local Offer. Consultation questions covered the pace, process and phasing of transition to the new system.

138. For each question about the transfer from statements and LDAs to EHC plans, the largest group of respondents (in many cases the majority) agreed with the Government's proposals.

139. Response rates for these questions were relatively low compared to questions on the Code of Practice. We received between 364 and 403 responses to these questions.

**43 Some children and young people will be undergoing special educational needs assessments on the current system on 1 September 2014. Should that assessment result in a statement/Learning Difficulty Assessment or an Education, Health and Care plan? Please explain the reason for your opinion.**

There were **397** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Education, Health and Care Plan:	212	53%
Statement/Learning Difficulty Assessment:	102	26%
Not Sure:	83	21%

## Analysis

140. More than half of respondents (53%) thought that needs assessments for statements and LDAs that are ongoing on 1 September 2014 should result in an EHC plan. Many of these respondents thought that this would avoid children and young people having to go through a further process to transfer them to the new system, and thus reducing burdens on families and avoiding additional work during the transition period for local authorities.

## Pace of transition

**44 Do you agree that the overall period for transition from statements of SEN to Education, Health and Care plans should be three years? Please explain the reason for your opinion. If you do not agree, please say what timeframe you think would be appropriate.**

There were **401** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	193	48%
No:	113	28%
Not Sure:	95	24%

**45 Do you agree that Learning Difficulty Assessments should be phased out within two years? Please explain the reason for your opinion. If you do not agree, please say what timeframe you think would be appropriate.**

There were **374** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	175	47%
Not Sure:	110	29%
No:	89	24%

## Analysis

141. The largest group of respondents agreed with our proposals for LDAs to be phased out within two years (47%) and that the overall transition from statements should take place within three years (48%). Understandably, some respondents wanted to see a shorter transition period, but there was a common concern about the capacity of local authorities to deliver good quality EHC plans within the proposed timeframe, and within existing resources. Some respondents suggested that the timeframe should be extended to allow local authorities greater flexibility.

## The process for transition

**46 Do you agree that local authorities, following consultation with young people and parents, should determine the best point in any given year to transfer a statement of SEN/Learning Difficulty Assessment to an Education, Health and Care plan, and that this should replace the usual annual review?**

There were **395** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	262	66%
Not Sure:	71	18%
No:	62	16%

**47 Do you agree that where a child or young person makes the transfer from a statement of SEN/Learning Difficulty Assessment to an Education, Health and Care plan, their plan should be written using the principles set out in section 7.9 of the draft SEN Code of Practice?**

There were **379** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	305	80%
Not Sure:	55	15%
No:	19	5%

**48 Do you agree that the right to request an Education, Health and Care plan should be limited to new referrals during the three year transition period? If not, why not?**

There were **384** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	173	45%
No:	147	38%
Not Sure:	64	17%

## Analysis

142. There was strong support (66%) among respondents for our proposal that local authorities should determine the best point in the year for the transfer to an EHC plan to take place, and that this should replace the annual review in that year. Some respondents were concerned that existing statements should continue to be reviewed at least annually during the transition period.
143. There was also strong support among respondents for children and young people with existing statements and LDAs to transfer to EHC plans prepared in line with the principles set out in the Code of Practice. 80% supported this though some pointed out the additional burdens (and therefore increased costs) that this will place on local authorities.
144. The largest group of respondents (45%) agreed that the right to request an EHC plan should be limited to new referrals during the three year transition period. Many felt that this would help to make the transition period more manageable

## Phasing the transition

<b>49 a) Do you agree that government should establish a broad framework setting out the slowest acceptable rate of transfer from statements of SEN to Education, Health and Care plans? If not, why not?</b>		
There were <b>394</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	314	80%
Not Sure:	42	11%
No:	38	10%

<b>49 b) If yes, which of the two proposed frameworks for transfer from statements of SEN to Education, Health and Care plans do you support? Why do you support this option?</b>		
There were <b>364</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Option 1: Transfer at end of key stage:	137	38%
Option 2: Transfer at end of current phase of education:	110	30%
Not Sure:	50	14%
Other (please specify):	43	12%
None of the above:	24	7%

<b>50 Do you agree that young people with Learning Difficulty Assessments should be able to request to transfer to an Education, Health and Care plan at any point during the proposed two year transition period? If not, why not?</b>		
There were <b>368</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	208	57%
No:	82	22%
Not Sure:	78	21%

## Analysis

145. There was strong agreement (80%) that Government should establish a broad framework to guide the transfer from statements and LDAs to EHC plans, although opinions on the content of the framework differed. Of the options we proposed, transfer within the final year of a Key Stage had slightly greater support than transfer at the end of an educational phase (38% vs 30%).

146. A majority of respondents (57%) agreed that young people with LDAs should be able to request transfer to an EHC plan during the two year transition period. Feedback from consultation indicated strong agreement that young people with LDAs should be treated as a priority group.

## The Local Offer

<b>51 Which approach to implementing the Local Offer should be adopted? Please explain why.</b>		
There were <b>403</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Option 3: Introduce the local offer progressively from September 2014:	192	48%
Option 1: Introduce all local offer requirements from September 2014:	91	23%
Option 2: Introduce all local offer requirements from April 2015:	82	20%
Not Sure:	21	5%
Other (please specify):	10	2%
None of the above:	7	2%

## Analysis

147. The largest group of respondents (48%) thought that the Local Offer should be introduced progressively from September 2014 with a full Local Offer being published by September 2015 at the latest.

## Government response

148. The legal test for when a child requires an EHC plan remains the same as that for a statement under the Education Act 1996. Therefore, it is expected that all

those who have a statement and who would have continued to have one under the current system, will be transferred to an EHC plan: no-one should lose their statement and not have it replaced with an EHC plan simply because the system is changing. Local authorities have undertaken LDAs for young people either because they had a statement at school or because, they appear to the local authority to have a learning difficulty and they are receiving, or likely to receive, post-16 education or training or higher education. Therefore, the normal expectation is that young people who had LDAs and remain in further education or training during the transition period, who request an EHC plan and need a plan, will be issued with one.

149. We want to be sure that the transfer of children and young people from existing statements and LDAs happens at a pace that is achievable and maintains the quality of support to those making the transition and those still on the previous system. To reduce additional burdens on local authorities, we also want to avoid prolonged running of the existing and new SEN systems in tandem.

150. Young people with LDAs have fewer rights and protections than those with statements. To address this inequality and to make sure they get the support they need to be well prepared for adulthood, we think it is important to prioritise the transfer of this group to the new system. It remains our intention to phase out LDAs by September 2016.

151. We have decided to extend the transition period for children and young people with statements to 1 April 2018. This will allow additional time for those local authorities who need it (particularly those with a high proportion of statements) but will not prevent them from completing the transition earlier. Our intention is that local authorities will prioritise the transfer of children and young people at key transition points – such as entry to primary school, primary to secondary school, and secondary school to further education. This will ensure momentum is maintained throughout the transition period and will recognise the points at which local authorities would have conducted significant reviews in any case.

152. The Government is committed to funding new burdens on local authorities and we are providing additional funding for transferring children and young people with statements and LDAs to the new system.

153. We agreed the Local Offer should be introduced progressively from September 2014.

154. We will shortly publish an Order setting out the arrangements that will operate during this transition period. It will be accompanied by explanatory guidance for local authorities.

## **PART III Main findings from spring 2014 consultation on Code of Practice**

### **Introduction**

155. The Department held a second shorter consultation on an amended draft of the Code in the spring of 2014, prior to it being laid before Parliament for approval in the summer.

156. This consultation was intended to give members of the public, professionals and the voluntary sector a chance to comment on the final draft of the Code, in particular the changes made to reflect amendments to the Bill and on the structure, layout and accessibility of the Code.

### **Summary of responses received**

157. The second online consultation, which closed on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2014, received over 215 responses. A full breakdown of the categories of respondents is set out in Annex B. Respondents were asked to select a category that best described the organisation that they were responding on behalf of.<sup>15</sup>

158. The largest single category of respondents was 'voluntary organisations', followed by 'parents/carers' and local authorities. However, when 'parents/carers' and representatives from 'parent partnership' organisations are taken together they represent the largest single body of respondents. Some types of respondent, for example representative and professional bodies, represent the views of significant groups of people in comparison with individual respondents.

159. Respondents were asked a series of nine questions, which focused specifically on whether new duties contained in the accompanying draft of the Code were clear. These duties were added as a result of amendments made to the Code during the final passage of the Children and Families Bill.

---

<sup>15</sup> Respondents were allowed to select more than one category of respondent type that best identified them. For the purposes of this consultation we undertook a further analysis of the responses to identify the single best category that identified those respondents who had selected more than one.

## Summary of responses by consultation question

### Question 1

<b>1 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include disabled children and young people in the provisions on identifying children and young people, integrating education, health and care provision, joint commissioning, the local offer and providing information and advice? (Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4)</b>		
There were <b>172</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	95	55%
No:	47	27%
Not Sure:	30	18%

### Analysis

160. Overall, the majority of respondents who answered this question answered 'Yes' (55%) that the latest revisions to the Code clearly took account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include disabled children and young people. Just over a quarter of respondents (27%) felt that the changes made to the Code did not clearly reflect amendments to the Children and Families Bill and 17% were 'Not Sure'.

161. Of those who responded to this question, local authorities were the most positive with 83% answering 'Yes' that revisions to the Code to include disabled children and young people within the scope of the reforms were clear. 88% and 64% of School Head Teachers/Teachers respectively answered 'Yes' to this question. Parents and voluntary sector organisations were less positive about the clarity of the duties in relation to disabled children and young people, with 34% answering 'Yes' in both cases.

162. A significant number of responses to this question were consistent in welcoming the inclusion of 'disability' throughout the Code and particularly welcomed the inclusion of 'disability' in the title of the document and references to the Equality Act 2010. Many respondents felt that the Code was now clearer on the duties to identify, support and provide information and advice for disabled children and young people who do not have SEN.

163. There were general calls to improve consistency in the use of phrases and terms used in the Code to describe SEN and disability. One particular concern

was clarity on the term ‘reasonable adjustments’ and how they differed from special educational provision. Some respondents felt that the Code did not provide enough information on support for disabled children under two.

## Government response

164. We have checked the Code, and these chapters in particular, for consistent use of terminology, clarified the term ‘reasonable adjustments’ and made clear that the duty under the Equality Act to make such adjustments is an ongoing and ‘*anticipatory*’ duty.

165. We have also further clarified the duties in relation to mainstream education, drawing where appropriate on the guidance in *Inclusive Schooling*. We have added to the text in Chapters 5 and 9 on support for disabled children under two.

## Question 2

<b>2 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include children and young people in the local authority duties to provide information and advice? (Chapter 2)</b>		
There were <b>167</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	99	59%
No:	36	22%
Not Sure:	32	19%

## Analysis

166. Respondents to this question answered favourably, with 59% stating that the changes made to the Code clearly took account of amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include children and young people in local authority duties to provide information and advice. Just over a fifth of respondents (22%) stated that they felt the changes were not clearly reflected and a similar number (19%) said they were ‘Not Sure’.

167. Local authorities, Further Education Principal/Teacher and Teachers and SENCOs were all very positive about the changes made to the Code to clarify information and advice duties. Of the local authorities who answered the question 88% answered ‘Yes’, while 86% and 88% of Further Education Principal/Teachers

and other teachers answered 'Yes'. Responses from parents and voluntary sector organisations were mixed, with 30% of parents and 39% voluntary sector organisations answering 'Yes'.

168. Most of the comments made by respondents under this question related to points of clarification in the text of the Code and requests to strengthen duties, such as changing references to 'should consider' to 'should'. Some respondents expressed concern on use of the term 'advocacy' in different contexts in the Code and whether it was referred to consistently.

169. A number of respondents asked for greater levels of detail to be included, such as making better links to 'mental capacity', careers services and relevant legislation. Other respondents felt that the role of information, advice and support services in supporting young people and their parents through the appeals process should be strengthened.

### Government response

170. We have made a number of drafting changes to the text in Chapter 2 of the Code to emphasise the importance of 'co-production' and to provide additional information on mental capacity and disagreement resolution processes. We have also taken on board calls to strengthen the role of information, advice and support services by emphasising their importance in supporting young people and families through the appeals process and ensuring that local authorities do offer support to those who 'require it' rather than 'request it'.

### Question 3

<b>3 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to provide for local authorities to set out what action they intend to take in response to comments from children, young people and parents on the local offer? (Chapter 4)</b>		
There were <b>159</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	98	62%
No:	32	20%
Not Sure:	29	18%

## Analysis

171. Respondents were overwhelmingly positive about changes to the Code to reflect amendments to the Children and Families Bill relating to the local offer; 62% of respondents felt that the changes were clearly reflected. A fifth of respondents said 'No' that the changes were not clearly reflected and just under a fifth (18%) were 'Not Sure'.
172. Respondents to this question felt that the revised Code was much clearer and more explicit when describing the duty on local authorities to publish details of their action plan in response to comments from children, young people and their parents on the Local Offer. Further Education Principal/Teacher, local authority and parent partnership respondents were highly positive, with 84%, 85% and 80% answering 'Yes' respectively. Parents and voluntary sector responses were more mixed with 32% and 44% answering 'Yes' respectively.
173. Most of the comments made by respondents concerned implementation and the practicalities of consulting with parents and young people on the development and review of the Local Offer. Respondents wanted the consultation process to be as wide-ranging as possible and in the spirit of 'co-production'. They also stated that local authorities need to support young people and parents with SEN or a disability to be able to contribute to decisions and should establish the issues on which young people most want to be engaged so that they can have a real say in what services are provided for them.
174. In addition to concerns about the practicalities of local authority consultation arrangements on the Local Offer, respondents wanted to ensure that information was shared both ways between local authorities and local Health and Wellbeing Boards, so that the health needs and priorities of their local communities could be better understood and responded to, including the needs of those with SEN without an EHC plan. There were also calls for the inclusion of case studies and best practice material in the Code to support the consistency of the implementation of the Local Offer nationally.
175. Some respondents raised the issue of redress and how they would hold their local authority to account if they felt that it was not taking the action it set out in response to comments. Local authorities wanted greater clarification of how they could ensure schools co-operated with them in relation to the Local Offer.

## Government response

176. In response to comments raised by respondents we have made a number of changes to the final Code, particularly in respect of further clarifying the duties on local authorities when consulting on the Local Offer when publishing and sharing

comments received and setting out the action they intend to take in response to these comments. We have made it clear that local authorities ‘should’ co-produce the Local Offer with children, young people and parents. We have also made it clear that local authorities should share comments with Health and Wellbeing Boards to help inform the development of local health provision, including for those without EHC plans.

177. Whilst we received further calls in this consultation from respondents to include case studies and best practice material in the Code to help support implementation of the Local Offer, as made clear in Part I of this response the Department will work with its partners to provide information of this kind alongside the Code.

## Question 4

<b>4 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to clarify when health and social care is to be treated as special educational provision? (Chapters 4 and 9)</b>		
There were <b>152</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	71	47%
No:	44	29%
Not Sure:	37	24%

## Analysis

178. Almost half of all respondents (47%) to this question answered ‘Yes’ that changes to the revised Code took account of amendments to the Children and Families Bill which clarify when health and social care should be treated as SEN provision. Just under a third of respondents answered ‘No’ that they felt the Code was not clear on this aspect and just under a quarter (24%) were ‘Not Sure’.

179. Further Education Principal/Teachers were overwhelmingly positive about changes to the Code in respect of when health and social care provision should be treated as SEN provision, with 85% of those who answered saying ‘Yes’. Local authorities and parents were less clear; voluntary sector respondents were equally split between those who answered ‘Yes’, ‘No’ and ‘Not Sure’, and 37% of parents answered ‘Yes’ and 37% answered ‘No’.

180. Most respondents to this question felt that changes to the Code to clarify when

health and social care is to be treated as SEN provision were too broad. Local authorities who responded were split between those who felt broad and flexible arrangements were appropriate, whilst others felt that they would not deliver real change.

181. Some respondents felt that the revised draft of the Code still needed to be clearer on the support that children or young people without EHC plans would receive. They felt that reinforcing individually owned duties for health and social care would reduce the risk of a ‘two-tier’ system being created. A number of respondents were concerned that the Code was too focused on health provision and there was not strong enough emphasis on social care or on post-16 support and preparing for adulthood.

## Government response

182. We have considered the points made by respondents. Chapters 4 *Local Offer* and 9 *Education, Health and Care Needs Assessments and Plans* in the Code clarify that health or social care provision that educates or supports a child or young person is to be treated as special educational provision in line with section 21(5) of the Children and Families Act 2014 and acknowledges that decisions about how they are to be treated must be made taking account of the children and young people concerned. This can only be done locally. The references to health care are included to reflect the long-standing position established through case law in relation to this issue.

## Question 5

<b>5 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to require local authorities to include the social care services they must deliver under the Chronically Sick and Disabled person’s Act 1970 in Educational Health and Care (EHC) plans? (Chapter 9)</b>		
There were <b>154</b> responses to this question		
<b>Options</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Yes:	75	49%
Not Sure:	44	29%
No:	35	23%

## Analysis

183. Nearly half of all respondents (49%) who answered this question felt that the revised Code clearly reflected the changes made to the Children and Families Bill to require local authorities to include the social care services they must deliver in EHC plans. Nearly a third of respondents (29%) were 'Not Sure' and nearly a quarter (23%) said 'No'.
184. Of the local authorities who responded to this question 68% answered 'Yes' that the Code was clear about the duties on them to include the social care services they must deliver in EHC plans. 75% of Further Education Principal/Teachers also felt that this duty was clear in the Code. The largest proportion of parents who answered this question stated they were 'Not Sure' (48%) and 43% of voluntary sector organisations answered 'No' the Code was not clear on this.
185. Many respondents said they found the explanation of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Person's Act 1970 (CSDPA) and which services to include in the EHC plan helpful. Respondents who answered this question stated that it would be helpful to include a fuller explanation of the CSDPA in the Code and how it relates to Section 17 of the Children Act 1989. Some respondents suggested this would fit best in Chapter 10 in the section on children and young people with social care needs. A number of respondents requested further details on how short breaks services will be integrated into EHC plans and under which legislation, whilst others requested that more information be included in Chapter 11 on social care appeal rights.

## Government response

186. In the light of these responses, we have made some amendments to Chapters 9 and 10 of the Code, specifically to clarify (in the table in Chapter 9 explaining the sections of the EHC plan) which legislation short breaks are provided under, and added additional guidance in Chapter 10 on how the CSDPA relates to the Children Act 1989.

## Question 6

**6 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to clarify the duties on local authorities in respect of young people over 18 with SEN. These are to consider whether a young person requires additional time, in comparison to the majority of others of the same age who do not have SEN, to complete his or her education or training, and to have regard to whether educational or training outcomes specified in an EHC plan have been achieved when considering whether or not to cease to maintain the plan? (Chapters 8 and 9)**

There were **151** responses to this question

Options	Responses	
Yes:	61	40%
No:	61	40%
Not Sure:	29	20%

## Analysis

187. Respondents to this question were equally split between those who felt the revised Code was clear on this amendment (40%) to the Children and Families Bill to clarify the duties on local authorities in respect of young people over 18 with SEN and those who did not (40%). A fifth of respondents (20%) were 'Not Sure' on whether this was clear in the Code.

188. Local authorities who answered this question answered favourably, with 70% answering 'Yes' that the Code was clear in respect of duties on them to support young people over 18 with SEN. However, Further Education Principal/Teachers who answered the question were less clear, with 67% answering 'No'. The majority of parents and voluntary sector organisations who responded felt the duties were either not clear (41% and 52% respectively) or were 'Not Sure' (26% and 36% respectively).

189. There was concern about the assertion in Chapter 9 that there was no entitlement to EHC plans for young people aged 19-25. There were also concerns about whether the draft Code made it sufficiently clear that young people may cease to need an EHC plan at any stage between 19-25, and whether 'clear evidence' might place too high a threshold for local authorities to consider whether the SEN provision in an EHC plan will help a young person make progress towards agreed outcomes. A few respondents also expressed concern about how EHC outcomes would be agreed, and some said that the sense of ambition for young people was not clear in this section.

## Government response

190. We have amended the Code to make it clear that there is no *automatic* entitlement to an EHC plan, as the previous wording might have been misinterpreted to mean that young people aged 19-25 could not have EHC plans. We have also made it clearer that young people aged 19-25 can leave education, or cease to need an EHC plan at any point. To address concerns about the high threshold of ‘clear evidence’ on whether or not the SEN provision in a young person’s EHC plan will enable them to make progress towards agreed outcomes, the Code now refers to ‘relevant evidence’.

191. We have added a cross reference in the section on 19-25 year olds to where in Chapter 9 the principles of good outcomes are laid out. These principles were informed by extensive consultation with Pathfinder local authorities, the college sector and disability groups. There are many sections of the Code which set out the need for local authorities to be ambitious for young people and we have added a further reference to the section on 19-25 year olds, to ensure that local authorities make the connection between that need for ambition and decisions about EHC plans for 19-25 year olds.

## Question 7

<b>7 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include young offenders in assessment and planning duties that are broadly similar to those for other children and young people? (Chapter 10)</b>		
There were <b>126</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	83	66%
Not Sure:	26	21%
No:	17	13%

## Analysis

192. A majority of the respondents to this question answered ‘Yes’ (66%) that the changes to the Code to reflect amendments to the Children and Families Bill to include young offenders in assessment and planning duties were clear. 21% of respondents answered that they were ‘Not Sure’ and 13% said ‘No’.

193. In particular, local authorities and Further Education Principal/Teachers were highly supportive of changes to the Code in this area, with 88% of local authorities

answering 'Yes' and 93% of Further Education Principal/Teachers answering 'Yes'. This is compared with 25% of parents and 28% of voluntary sector organisations who responded 'Yes'. A significant percentage of the parents (54%) who responded were 'Not Sure' about whether these arrangements were clearly reflected in the Code.

194. Most of the free text responses to this question welcomed the inclusion of this group of young people in the Code. Many of the comments made related to how the inclusion of young offenders in assessment and planning duties would work in practice. A significant number of respondents wanted the language used in this section of the Code to be strengthened and felt there were too many 'shoulds' and not enough 'musts'. A number of voluntary sector organisations suggested that this section of the Code should only be published when any associated regulations have been commenced and the legal provisions can be reflected in the guidance.

195. A number of the other comments made by respondents focused on practical issues associated with implementation, such as how young people without EHC plans would be supported in youth offender establishments and how the arrangements would work when a young person is placed outside their home local authority. Also raised were issues around funding the support required by this group of young people and a call for further guidance and best practice material to support successful implementation.

## **Government response**

196. The Department welcomes the support that the inclusion of this section within the Code of Practice has received. In light of the consultation responses we have amended this section in the Code to clarify that these duties will be coming into force in April 2015 after regulations have been laid to underpin the requirements.

197. In response to specific requests for clarification we have amended the text in this chapter of the Code to make clearer the difference between 'maintaining' and 'keeping' an EHC plan. We have clarified both when a child or young person can be brought to the attention of the local authority as someone who may have SEN, and rights of appeal. We have also made clearer how the educational needs of all children and young people in custody will be met, including those with special educational needs but without an EHC plan.

198. In advance of commencement of the young offenders duties in April 2015, as set out in Chapter 10, the Department will be working closely with the sector to explore and develop the information, advice and guidance needed to support implementation, and will also be consulting on draft regulations to underpin the new duties and responsibilities.

## Question 8

<b>8 Does the Code clearly reflect the changes made to the consultation draft to take account of the amendments to the Children and Families Bill to extend disagreement resolution arrangements and mediation to health and social care as well as education? (Chapter 11)</b>		
There were <b>147</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	77	53%
No:	40	27%
Not Sure:	30	20%

### Analysis

199. A majority of respondents to this question (53%) answered 'Yes' that the Code clearly took account of amendments to the Children and Families Bill to extend to extend disagreement resolution arrangements to health and social care. Just over a quarter of respondents (27%) felt that it was not clear and a fifth (20%) were 'Not Sure'.
200. An large majority of Further Education Principal/Teachers and Teachers who answered this question answered positively, with 80% and 86% answering 'Yes' respectively. Local authorities who answered this question were also positive about whether the Code clearly reflected changes made to extend disagreement resolution services to health and social care, with 64% answering 'Yes'. Parents and voluntary sector representatives were less positive about the changes in the Code with 42% and 48% answering 'No' respectively.
201. Respondents to this question were broadly split into two groups: those who felt the Code is clear on these arrangements and those who felt that it could be made clearer. There were general calls for the diagrams in the Code to be improved to provide greater clarity on timescales and processes and calls for guidance on health and social care mediation to be separated out from that on education. Overall those who felt the Code was still unclear commented that the whole redress and complaints system was very complex and reiterated earlier calls for a single route of appeal.
202. A number of respondents who answered this question raised concerns about parental responsibility and said that parents retain overall responsibility until their child reaches 18. There were also requests for clearer guidance on how different routes of redress can be pursued.

## Government response

203. We have revised the initial diagrams in this section of the Code and replaced them with a table that sets out more clearly the different bodies or people with whom parents or young people can pursue redress.

204. We have taken account of repeated requests throughout the passage of the Bill for a 'single route' of appeal for education, health and social care. We have addressed this by widening the remit of the mediation and disagreement resolution arrangements to cover both health and social care services for those who are having needs assessments or have EHC plans. This means that there will be a single place where parents and young people can address their concerns across education, health and social care.

205. We will also, with the Ministry of Justice, be reviewing appeal and complaint arrangements for children and young people with education, health and care needs and, as part of that review, running pilots where the Tribunal will have the power to make recommendations about the health and social care content of EHC plans.

## Question 9

9 Do changes to the Code, and the plans to produce supplementary materials, address the responses to the main consultation on clarity, layout and accessibility?		
There were <b>176</b> responses to this question		
Options	Responses	
Yes:	73	41%
No:	58	33%
Not Sure:	45	26%

### Analysis

206. Some 41% of respondents to this question answered ‘Yes’ that the changes made to the Code in terms of clarity, layout and accessibility addressed concerns raised by respondents in the previous consultation. A third of respondents said ‘No’ and just over a quarter (26%) were ‘Not Sure’.

207. Over half of all local authorities (55%) and Further Education Principal/Teachers (52%) who responded to this question answered ‘Yes’ that changes to the Code had improved clarity and accessibility. Parents and voluntary sector organisations were less positive with 47% and 41% responding ‘No’ respectively.

208. Those who have to have regard to the Code generally found it clearer and easier to navigate. In particular, they welcomed separate chapters for early years, schools and further education and the ‘*Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years*’ chapter. They also welcomed the improved internal organisation of the chapters in the Code. Positioning of the principles at the start of the Code, and the plans for supplementary materials to help explain the changes in more detail were welcomed, particularly by parents and professionals.

209. Some respondents called in particular for further references to inclusive schooling to be threaded throughout the Code, for inconsistencies in the chapters on early years, schools and further education to be addressed, and for material from the *Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years* chapter to be moved to the chapter on further education.

### Government response

210. In response to comments, a number of sections have been revised. Some changes have been made to further reflect guidance from *Inclusive Schooling*.

Inconsistencies in the chapters on early years, schools and further education have been addressed including identification and review of EHC plans, when to involve specialists and the definition of progress and outcomes.

211. The material on high quality study programmes and careers advice in Chapter 8 (*Preparing for adulthood from the earliest years*) relates to schools, sixth form colleges and further education colleges so we have not moved it to Chapter 7 (*Further education*) but made references in both chapters on these issues.

212. We intend to publish a suite of supplementary guides for key audiences who must have regard to the Code, as well as for parents/carers and young people. These guides will provide an overview of the duties in the Code relevant to each audience as well as material that helps to explain clearly what the reforms mean in practice and where to go for further information and support. The availability of these guides will help to address concerns raised across this consultation about the accessibility and clarity of the Code for parents and young people in particular.

## **Annex A – Full list of draft regulations consulted on:**

- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Appeal regulations<sup>16</sup>
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Assessment and plan regulations
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Children’s appeal pilot scheme
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – ISS and ISP regulations
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Local Offer regulations
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Mediation regulations
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Personal Budgets regulations
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – Remaining in a special school without a plan
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – SEN information
- Draft 2013 SEN regulations – SENCO regulations

---

<sup>16</sup> All of these draft regulations have now been grouped together and renamed the Special Educational Needs and Disability Regulations 2014, apart from the SEN (Personal Budgets) regulations 2014.

## Annex B – Respondents to spring 2014 consultation

Please mark the category which best describes you as a respondent.		
Options	Responses	
Voluntary Organisation:	44	20%
Parent/Carer:	39	18%
Local Authority:	35	16%
Other:	33	15%
Further Education Principal/Teacher:	26	12%
Parent Partnership:	10	5%
Professional Association/Union:	10	5%
School Headteacher/Teacher:	8	4%
Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO):	8	4%
Educational Psychologist:	2	1%
Young Person (16+):	1	0%
Training/Apprenticeship Provider:	1	0%
Governor:	1	0%
Health Professional:	1	0%
Total:	219	100%

## Annex C – Full list of respondents to the autumn 2013 Consultation<sup>17</sup>

Organisation
Newman, Rebecca
Rolstone, Gemma
Galpin, Janet
Winguard, Andrew
O'Dare, Vanessa
Richardson, Paul
Moynihan, Marian
Evans, Cathy
Stacey, Gabrielle
Ms Marchesi & Ms Costa
Marrs-Gant, K
Smith, Sharon
Ryder Richardson, Jane
FORBES, HILARY
1 Voice - Communicating Together (Jenny Herd)
3 h's, The (zeenat khan)
4Children (John Davies)
4us2 (Andrea Bennett)
ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL 3A's (SONIA BLANDFORD)
ACORN CARE & EDUCATION (Mike Robinson)
ACORNS CHILDRENS HOSPICE (D STRUDLEY)
Action Cerebral Palsy (Oliver Cardinali)
Action Duchenne and Decipha CIC (Janet Hoskin)

---

<sup>17</sup> Respondents who asked for their details to be kept confidential are not included on this list. This list is a direct download from the Department's online consultation system so respondent's details appear as they have identified themselves when responding to the consultation.

Action for Children (Emma Scowcroft)
Additional Needs and Disability Partnership (Dave Winteringham)
Adviza careers information (Sue Brooks)
Aiming Higher (Katy Simister)
Ajimoto, Taiwo
Alloui, Adlane (Parent of a child with SEN)
Amaze and the PaCC (Rachel Travers)
AMBITIOUS ABOUT AUTISM (KATE WILLIAMS)
Amos, Alison
Ansell, Clive
Applefields School (George Gilmore)
Army Families Federation
Arnold, Louise
ASENT (Richard Beeden)
ASSET (Claire Franklin)
Association of School and College Leaders (Martin Ward)
Association of Colleges (Pauline Odlin)
Association of educational psychologists (GARY JONES)
ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE LEADERS (MARK McKIERNAN)
Atkins, Tony
ATL (Alison Ryan)
Baillon, Michelle (n/a)
Baker, Anna (National Star College)
Ball, Helen (Parent)
Bant, Suzanne
Barber, Nicky
Barking and Dagenham Community and Ed Psy Service (Karen Majors)
Barn, Jagdish
Barnet and Southgate College (David Byrne)

Barnsley College (Phil Briscoe)
Barnsley Local Authority (Tracy Jubb)
Barnsley Local Authority (Janine Muller)
BARNSLEY MBC (J LUNT)
BARNSLEY PARENT AND CARER FORUM (S WIKE)
Bartley, Lucy (Parents for Inclusion)
BATH AND NE SOMERSET COUNCIL. (Charlie Moat)
BATOD (Paul Simpson)
Beatty, Carol
BEDFORD COLLEGE (KATRINA O'BRIEN )
Bell, Liz (parent, TA at Special School)
Bennett, Pat
Bentfield Primary School Board of Governors (Katherine Rixson)
Beverley, Patsy
BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL (CHRIS ATKINSON )
Birth to Five Service , Lincs Local Authority. (Sarah Dalton)
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council (Susan Hayward)
Blackmore, Sandra (Rochdale MBC)
BLACKPOOL COUNCIL EARLY YEARS SEND. (JULIE WHEELAN )
Blackpool Local Authority (simon Jenner)
Blamires, Jeanine
Blizzard, Jane (Aiming Higher Together Patent Forum)
Booton, Sally (Parent)
Bosanquet, Claire
Bowden, Alison (Christ Church First School)
Bowler, John
Bowman, Peter
Bracknell Forest Borough Council (Amanda Wilton)
Bradford district SEND PARTNERSHIP (BILL TURNER)

Branton, Leeanne
Brelstaff, Keith
Brennan-Barrett, Pat (Northampton College)
Bridge, Emma
Brierley, Carole
Bright Sparks Nursery (Karen Llewellyn)
Brighton & Hove City Council (Hass Yilmaz)
Bristol City Coucil. Early Years Portage & Inclusion Team (Verity Goodchild)
Bristol Educational Psychology Service (Judith Evans)
British Academy of Childhood Disabililty (Kelly Robinson)
British Psychological Society, The
Brockenhurst College (Jill Lueddeke)
BROMLEY PARENT CARER FORUM
Brooks, Henrietta
Brown, Lyn (parent)
Brown, Claire
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL (MURIEL ALLEAUME)
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (Carole Morgan)
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (Liz Smith)
Bury CCG
BURY CHILDRENS SERVICES LEARNING DIVISION (LA) (C READ)
Bury Educational Psychology Service (Emma Harding)
Bush, Alison
Busy Bees (Ally Archer)
Calderdale Educational Psychology Service (Min O'Hara)
Calderdale Parents and Carers (Janine Wigmore)
Callaway, Charlotte
CAMDEN PARENT PARTNERSHIP PARENT CARER FORUM
Canavan, Carolyn

CANDI. PARENT PARTICIPATION FORUM (MIRANDA PARROTT)
CARE FOR THE FAMILY . (LISA EVANS)
CAREERS SOUTH WEST (John Davey)
Carroll, Julie (Hertfordshire County Council)
Carter, Louise
Central Bedfordshire parent carer forum. (S WALLIS)
CENTRE FOR STUDIES ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (ARTEMI SAKELLARIADIS)
CHAILEY HERITAGE FOUNDATION (HELEN HEWITT)
CHALLENGING BEHAVIOUR PROJECT, The (J Shurlock)
CHANGING FACES VOL ORG (JANE FRANCES)
Chavasse, Linda (Bradford Local Authority, educational psychologist)
Chennell, Paul
Cheshire Dyslexia Association (Julie Yaxley)
CESHIRE WEST AND CHESTER COUNCILS (D GITTINS)
CESHIRE WEST AND CHESTER PARENT CARER FORUM (Angela Steadman)
CHEUNG, LOUISE
CHILDCARE SETTINGS IN COUNTY DURHAM (GILLIAN BRIGGS )
Children and Young People's Mental Health Coalition (Paula Lavis)
CHILDRENS AND YOUNG PEOPLES SERVICES SUFFOLK LA (TONY SALE )
CHILDRENS SERVICES DEPT HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (J COUGHLAN )
CHILDRENS SERVICES DEVELOPMENT GROUP. (JESSICA MARCH)
CHILDRENS TRUST, The (ROB WOOD)
Chilton, James
Chorley & South Ribble Parent Carer Forum, Lancashire (S Titterington)
City of York Council (Carolyn Ford)
Clements, Liza
Cliffe, wendy (parent partnership oxfordshire)
Co-produced Telford PPS / PODs PCF parent consultation (Lesley Perks)
Communication Matters (Cathy Harris)

COMMUNICATION TRUST, The (CATHERINE HILLS)
24 LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TRACY MANDER)
CONTACT A FAMILY (LAURA BURLING)
Cooper , Ruth
Copestake, Clare
Corelli College (Angela Sweeney)
Cornwall Council (Rebecca Pollington)
CORNWALL LOCAL AUTHORITY (JEAN MURRAY)
COUNCIL FOR DISABLED CHILDREN (PHILLIPPA STOBBS)
COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL (ROGER LICKFOLD)
Coventry City Council, Sensory Support Service (Peter McCann)
Coxell, Martin
Crabbe, Biff
CRABE, BIFF
Critchley, Anna (Barnsley Educational Psychology Service/The University of Nottingham)
Cued Speech Association UK (Anne Worsfold)
Cullimore, Phil (Wokingham Parent Partnership)
Cumbria local authority (MARK TOOMEY )
Cumbria Parent partnership Service (Celia Jones)
Cyberbarn (Jennifer Skillen)
Daggett, Peter (PARENT CARER FORUM)
DARLINGTON PARENT PARTNERSHIP
DCYP PROGRAMME (NIGEL FULLTON )
De Pablo, Carmen (Tor Bridge High)
Deighton, Phil
Derbyshire County Council (Vicky Pealing)
DERWEN COLLEGE (RUTH THOMAS)
Devi, Anita
DEVON PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICES (Sue Brealey)

Dill-Russell, Roger (Abingdon & Witney College)
Dillon, Jayne (Parent)
Disability Rights UK (Andrea Lewis)
Disabled Children's Social Care Service (Jackie Parkin)
DODSWORTH ST JOHNS PRIMARY SCHOOL. (A KAMINSKI)
DORRINGTON , SUSAN
DORSET COUNTY COUNCIL (Lynn Frith)
Douglas, lisa
DOWDESWELL, BRONWEN
Down Syndrome Training & Support Service Ltd. (Louise Hobley)
DOWNS SYNDROME ASSOCIATION (VANDA RIDLEY )
Doyle, Margaret
Driver Youth Trust (Christopher Rossiter)
Dubsky, Rachel
DUKE, N
Durham County Council (Peter Lewis)
DYSLEXIA ACTION (S ANDERSON )
Dyslexia information group Tamworth (JULIE CAPPLEMAN-MORGAN )
Dyslexia-SpLD Trust, The (Mel Byrne)
Ealing Early Years Consultants (Rachelle Leslie)
Ealing, Hammersmith and West London College (Vivienne Berkeley)
Earlham Early Years Centre (ann Blackbourn)
EARLY YEARS ADVISORY TEAM. (S TANTON )
EARLY YEARS TEAM AT THE OPEN UNIVERSITY . (JOHN PARRY)
EAST RIDING PARENT CARER FORUM. (Shirley Pethnick)
Eastern Region Parent Carer Forum (Carol Kelsey)
Education Law Association (Eleanor Wright)
Education Law Practitioners' Group (Angela Jackman)
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST BARNESLEY LA. (BEN POWELL )

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY SERVICE TYNESIDE COUNCIL (KERRY WINDER)
Ely, Julie
Enfield Parents & Children (Mary Mannion)
Enfield Parents & Children (Linda Pryor)
EPIC LEEDS PARENT CARER PARTICIPATION FORUM
Epilepsy Action (Nicole Crosby-McKenna)
ERVIP (Paula Linford)
Espana, Zaida
Essential Mediation Ltd (Manda Sides)
Every Disabled Child Matters (Peter Hardy)
FACT BUCKINGHAMSHIRE
Fairfield Farm College (Janet Kenward)
Fallowfield, Ranti
Families United (Nicola Jones)
Family Action (Stacey Samuels)
FAMILY RIGHTS GROUP (JACINTA MARRON)
Farley Junior School (Margaret Trinder)
Findlay , Zanne (Applied Mediation)
FINES, MONICA
fisher, marilyn (Independent Parental Supporter PPS)
Fishergate Primary School (Llisa Solanki)
FORGAN, S
Frampton, Roz
Full of Life (Allison Ambrogi)
Fullbrook, Kate (Compton School, The)
Furlong, Julia
Further Ed college Hampshire (G GILCHRIST)
Garvey, Tessa
Gateshead Council (Elaine Boyes)

Gedge, Nancy
Gerrard, Sue
Giles, E
Gould, Tom
Grafham Grange Special Educational Trust (Terry Connolly)
Grantham College (Linda Houtby)
Green, Helen (Ealing Council)
Green, Suzanne
Greenfield Community College (Colin Fowler)
GREENWOOD DALE FOUNDATION TRUST (ROSEMARY NAPHTHINE)
Gregory, Emma
Guest, Gill
HACKNEY LEARNING TRUST (S CURRIE)
Hackney Learning Trust Local Authority. (Siobhan Currie)
Hackney Teacher's Association (Richard Reiser)
HAIRE, ANNE (HEALTH PROFESSIONAL)
HALL MEAD SCHOOL (E Bint)
Halton Borough Council (John Gibbon)
Halton Borough Council (Pamela Beaumont)
Hampshire Parent Partnership Service (Elaine Fish)
Hampshire Parent/Carer Network (Sharon Smith)
HARRINGTON, JILL
Harris, Lisa (Thorney Island CP School)
Harvey, Toni
Hassan, mohamed
Hatcher, Mary
Havering College of F&HE (Emma Thompson)
Hawkins, Abigail (Top valley academy)
Hayes, Ben

Hearing Support Service (Kate Wells)
Henley College Coventry (Olwyn Seal )
HEREWARD COLLEGE (SHEILA FLEMING)
Hertfordshire County Council (E Higson)
Higgins, Maria
Higgins, Michael
High Oakham Primary School (Fiona Watt)
Hindle, Sarah
Hines, Alistair (Wokingham Parent Partnership)
HiP (Hackney Independent Forum for Parents and Carers of Children with Disabilities (Rosalind Grainger)
HIPKISS, AMANDA (GUVENOR AT MULLEN SCHOOL CORNWALL)
HM Stack Consulting (Heather Stack)
Holland, Verity (Wokingham Borough Council)
Holy Family Playgroup (Ellen Davies)
Holy Trinity C E Primary School (Fiona Whiteside)
Home Education Advisory Service (Jane Lowe)
Homefield College (Gerry Short)
HOMERTON CHILDRENS CENTRE (LOUISE YARROW)
Howard of Effingham School (Julie Menhennett)
Howarth, Penny
Hoyland, Lynn (Dearne ALC, The)
Luton Borough Council (Harriet Martin)
Portsmouth City Council (Julia Katherine)
Telford College of Arts and Technology (Mary Gilbert)
Hull City Council (Sue Day)
HULL COLLEGE GROUP (JANE HALLIDAY)
Hull Parents Forum (Sue Wilson)
Hutchins, Jean

Hyman, Hazel
In Control (Nic Crosby)
INCLUDE ME TOO (JANET COOPER )
INDEPENDEENT PARENTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVICE. (Chris Gravell)
INDEPENDEENT PARENTAL SUPPORTERS (C Lee)
Independent Association of Preparatory Schools (Julie Robson)
IndePenDent Business Services Ltd (Miriam Henson)
Independent Schools Council (Sunena Stoneham)
Indigo foundation network (J L Parsonage)
Insight for Carers (Rachael Gardener)
ISGC (MARGARET JONES)
Isle of Wight and Southampton Psychology Service (Alyce McCourt)
Islington Council (David Wainwright)
Islington Council (Candy Holder)
ISLINGTON EARLY YEARS SERVICE (PAULINE FOSTER)
Ivill, Di
Jarvis, Kaye
Jenner, Simon
Jewes, Paula (Merton Mencap, Kids First)
Jigsaws Childcare Ltd (Nicole Newiss)
Johnson, Maggie
Kairos Forum, The (Cristina Gangemi)
Karim, Elizabeth
Keever, John
Kelly, Mary (self)
KENT ASSOC OF FE COLLEGES (L ANNING)
KENT COUNTY COUNCIL (JULIE ELY)
KENT EDUCATIONAL PSHYCHOLOGY SERVICE (A HEATHER)
Kent Parent as Equal Partners (Sarah Selby-Bird)

KENT PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE
Keystone Consulting (Fiona Cuthbertson)
KIDS (Tina Patel)
Killick, Anne (BARNSELEY MBC)
Kings' School (Matthew Leeming)
Kirklees Council (Alison O'Sullivan)
LA (Sheila Kingsland)
LA (Victoria Coyle)
LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (SALLY RILEY )
LANCASTRIAN ORGANISATION (D CALVERT)
Lawrence, Catherine (Moreland Primary School)
Le Blond, Marian
Lee, David
Leicestershire County Council (Chris Bristow)
Leonard, Rachel (Durham Educational Psychology Service)
Lewell, Mary (Diss High School)
Lewis, Alison
Lexden Springs (Simon Wall)
Lincolnshire CC (Debbie Barnes)
Lincolnshire County Council (Jill Hodges)
LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (S MIDDLETON )
Lincolnshire Parent Carer Council (Therese Lord)
Linkage College (Matthew Orford)
Listen for change ,carers centre (Sara Dolan)
Liverpool City Council (Karen Gleave)
LIVERPOOL PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE. (C LEE)
LIVERPOOL PARENT PARTNESHIP (C Lee)
Liverpool PPSAG (Hilary Doody)
LOCAL AUTHORITY (GEMMA WHITFIELD)

Local Authority (Wendy Hedge)
Local authority BLACKPOOL (Mark Chevreau)
Local Authority Rotherham. (Fiona Featherstone)
Local Authority SEN Support Service. Hearing Impairment Team (Clare Armitage)
Local Government Association (Liz Hobson)
LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN (MARIE BENCH)
Lombardo, Catherine
LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY (HELEN NORRIS)
LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD (G READ)
LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM (KEITH MARTIN)
LONDON BOROUGH OF NEWHAM (JAMES HOURIGAN)
LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES (Lindiwe Mokoena)
London borough of Southwark Children and adult's services (M HAEUSLER)
LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS (ASMA MUSHTAQ)
London Borough of Croydon (Trisha Holmes)
London Borough of Ealing (Geraldine Wassell)
London Borough of Hillingdon (Ben Levy)
London Borough of Merton (Kaye Beeson)
London Borough of Redbridge (Peter Bouldstridge)
London Borough of Tower Hamlets (Anne Canning)
MACYNTYRE (MANDEEP THANDI)
Maidstone Special needs Support service. (Ailsa McMahon)
Manchester Local Authority (Ann Thornber)
Manchester Parent Partnership
Manchester Parents for Change
Manley, Helen
Marian Vian Primary School (Karen Swain)
Markfield (Samantha Howard)
Markwell, Janet (Parent Partnership Service)

MARLBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL, The (Jen Egginton)
Martell, David
McClellan, Sarah-Jo
Mears, Anna
Medway Parents and Carers Forum (Keith Clear)
Medway SENCO and inclusion managers forum (C Challis)
Mencap (James Robinson)
Merton Parent Partnership Service (Chris Wilson)
MidKent College (Lindsey Morgan)
Miles, K
Milford, Donna
Milton Keynes Council (Gillian Shurrock)
MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL (Uday Thakar)
MILTON KEYNES OPEN UNIVERSITY (j Rix)
Morewood, Gareth
Morgan, Tim
Morgan, Scilla (Hackney Parent Partnership Service)
Moyes, Pauline
Munro, Elaine (Wokingham Borough Council)
Murphy, Anne (Ellis practice)
NAHT (Sion Humphreys)
NAS
NAS Greenwich Branch (Julie Raven)
NASEN (Jane Friswell)
NASENCO REVIEW PANEL (L PETERSEN)
NASUWT TEACHERS UNION (SONJA HALL)
National Association of Family Information Services (NIAL McVICAR)
National Association of Independent Schools & Non-Maintained Special Schools (NASS) (Claire Dorer)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRICIPLE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS (Mark Hancock)
National Autistic Society (Dan Leighton)
NATIONAL BLIND CHILDRENS SOCIETY (Carl Freeman)
National Complaints Managers Group (NCMG) (John Gibbon)
NATIONAL DAY NURSERIES ASSOC (LAURA ROBshaw)
NATIONAL DEAF CHILDRENS SOCIETY (I NOON )
National Governors' Association (Gillian Allcroft)
National Inclusion Network Co-ordinators (Terry Waller)
National Network of Advisory Teachers for Physically Impaired Pupils. NNATPIP (Ian Townsend)
National Network of Parent Carer Forums (C. A. Britton)
National Parent Partnership Network (Daisy Russell)
National Portage Association (Gary Walker)
NATIONAL SEND FORUM (LORRAINE PETERSEN )
NATIONAL STAR COLLEGE (MARY HUSSEY)
NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS (Rebecca Harvey)
NatSIP (Lindsey Rousseau)
Natspec: Assoc of National Specialist (Alison Boulton)
Naval Families Federation (Sara Smith)
New Park High School (Almut Bever-Warren)
New Road School (Marilyn Reeves)
Newcastle LA , WELLBEING,CARE AND LEARNING DIRECTORATE (Lara Lillico)
Newcastle local Authority, education psychology service. (Iara Lillico)
NHS Bradford Districts & NHS Bradford City CCGs (Ruth Hayward)
NHS HULL CLINICAL COMMISIONING GROUP (Bernie Dawson)
NICHOLSON , FIONA (INDEPENDEdNT HOME EDUCATION)
Nicholson, Fiona (Edyourself)
NNPCF (North West) (Sherann Hillman)
Norbury, Rebecca

North Somerset Council (Karen Hall)
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (MICHELLE ALLISON )
Northamptonshire County Council (Gwyn Botterill)
Northamptonshire Parent Partnership Service (Dino Cirelli)
Nottingham City Community Educational Psychology Service (Ruth Illman)
Nottingham City Council (Alison Weaver)
NOTTINGHAM SEN PATHFINDER. (MARK EVANS)
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE EPS. SEND POLICY AND PROVISION
Novak, Doreen
Nursery (Gillian Weightman)
NURTURE GROUP NETWORK, The (KEVIN KIBBLE )
NUT Hackney (S HALL)
Oaklands College (Carole Jones)
OGBODOBRI, M
Old London Road Pre-School (Sarah Bateson)
OLDHAM LOCAL AUTHORITY (Scott Boyd)
Oliver, Jenny
The Well Trust (Virginia Ursell)
One Education Ltd (Susan Posada)
OnlineTraining Ltd. (Hugh Clench)
Osborne, Sarah
Our Voice Enfield Parent forum (Fazilla Amide)
OUR VOICE WORCESTERSHIRE
OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL SEN MANAGER. (Janet Johnson)
OXFORDSHIRE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY SERVICE (SMIT DEBORAH)
Oxfordshire Educational Psychology Unit (Katherine Davidson)
PACEY (Aaron Hunter)
Padfield, Lynne (Barnsley Academy)
PAEDIATRIC CONFERENCE FORUM (FRANCES POWRIE)

Paediatric Mental Health Association (Max Davie)
Pakpour Tabrizi, Laela (Corelli College)
Pals Pre-school (Teresa Robinson)
Pardo, Ollie
PARENT CARER FORUM
PARENT CARER FORUMS VARIOUS. (LARA ROBINSON )
Parent Carers Voice, Oxfordshire (Susan Dorrington)
Parent Forum (Wiltshire Parents Carer Council)
Parent Partnership (Leila Barron)
Parent Partnership (Janina Schiebler)
Parent Partnership east riding council (AMANDA WARD)
Parent Partnership Oxfordshire (Marian Roiser)
PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE (WHITING)
PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE COVENTRY . (I Pitham)
Parent partnership WEST MIDLANDS WOLVERHAMPTON. (LUCY HARRIS)
PARENTS ACTIVE (NANDINI GANESH)
Parents Advocacy Network-Westminster (catherine Slater)
Parents for Inclusion (Cornelia Broesskamp)
PARENTS IN PARTNERSHIP STOCKPORT (Paul Harper)
Parents in Power (Pat Bolton)
Parker, Richard (EPs)
Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (Sally Sykes)
parliamentary health service ombudsman. (ALISON MOULDS)
Participation Works (Catherine Hodder)
Patchwork Private Childrens Daycare (Julie Nash)
PATHFINDERS AND SHORT BREAKS DISABILITY SERVICE. (HELEN PARNHAM)
PAX Parent Forum (Marilyn Hoskins)
Pearce, Beth
Pen Green Centre (Annette Cummings)

Penfold, Ian (Parer/Carer)
Pennine Camphill Community (Steve Hopewell)
Perry, Richard (Parent)
Petch, Jane (Parent)
Peterborough City Council (Saiqa Iqbal)
Petersen, Lorraine
Plumpton, Wendy
Plymouth City Council (Sarah McConkey)
PLYMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (ALLAN FULLER)
POOLE LOCAL AUTHORITY (M CHAMBERLAINE)
Portland College (Mark Dale)
Preston's College (Louise Birchall)
Primary School (Bridget Burke )
Primary School (Jamie Maloy)
Primary School and Nursery Unit (Julie Field)
PRIORS COURT SCHOOL (S BAJDALA-BROWN)
Prospects (Michael Larbalestier)
PSYCHOLOGY AND INCLUSION SERVICE MEDWAY COUNCIL (JANE MARRIOTT)
Pyne, Heather (Parent)
QUEEN ALEXANDER COLLEGE (Hugh Williams)
Quilter, Ruth (Ruth Quilter Associates Ltd)
REACH Wokingham (Julie Monahan)
Reaching Families (Grainne Saunders)
Rees, Felicity
Reynolds, Michael
RNIB COLLEGE LOUGHBOROUGH (TONY WARREN )
ROYAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR BLIND PEOPLE. (HELEN DEARMAN)
Robertson, Christopher (University of Birmingham)
Robertson, Christopher (School of Education - University of Birmingham - SENCO)

National Award Training Provider)
Rotherham Local Authority (Helen barre)
Rotherham Parent Partnership Service (Pip Wise)
Route, Anna
ROYAL BORO OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD, The (RHIDIAN JONES)
Royal College of Nursing (Fiona Smith)
Royal College of Psychiatrists, The (Helen Phillips)
Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (Mark Hope)
Royal National College for the Blind, The (Sheila Tallon)
Sales, Lynn (Riverview C of E Primary School)
SALFORD CITY COUNCIL (CHLOE HOWARTH )
Samuel, Jonathan
Sanderson, Ruth
Sandwell Inclusion Support (Peter Sniadowski)
SCARF - SEN parent network (Cathy Cook)
School (Clare Jeffries)
School (Peter Bibby)
Scope (Carena Rogers)
Scott, Angela
Seach, Diana
SEN & ED PSY SOMERSET COUNTY COUNCIL (EILEEN COOMBES)
SEN legal ltd (Karen McAtamney)
SEN PARENT PARTNERSHIP BIRMINGHAM (N TAYNTON )
SENAD GROUP (B jONES)
SENCo Network and Advisory Service response (Nicola Davis )
SENCo-Forum (Christopher Robertson)
SEND pathfinder SE7. EAST SUSSEX LOCAL AUTHORITY (TRACY MANDER)
SEND Strategy Group (Jackie Parkin)
SENDac (NIKI ELLIOT)

Sense (Kate Fitch)
Shanahan, Della
Sheffield city council response (LESLEY CHESHIRE)
Sheffield Parent Carer Forum (Eva Juusola)
Shepherd, Maureen (Coombe Hill Infants School)
Shire (Kate Eden)
SHORT BREAKS NETWORK (CHRIS CHART)
Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin PPS (Lesley Perks)
Shropshire Council (Claire Vuckovic)
Shropshire Parent and Carer Council (Sarah Thomas)
Sinson, Jane
slough boro council (JAKIE WRIGHT )
Smart, M L
SMIRA (V Roe)
Smith, Sharon (-)
Smith, Kieron (none)
Smith, Jane
Social Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties Association (SEBDA) (Andy Bloor)
SOLIHULL SCHOOL FORUM (JANET MARSH)
SOLIHULL SPECIALIST INCLUSION SERVICE (Andrea baker)
Solihull Specialist Inclusion Support Service (Fiona Phillips)
Solway Comm Tec College (G Wiggington)
SOMERSET COUNTY COUNCIL (T WALLER)
SOMERSET COUNTY COUNCIL (VULNERABLE LEARNERS) (DAVE FARROW)
SOMERSET LOCAL AUTHORITY (LAUREN SMITH)
SOMERSET LOCAL AUTHORITY (SEN CASEWORKER) (ANNA MORGAN )
SOMMERSET PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE (KATHY PEARCE)
SOS!SEN (Marion Strudwick)
South Glos Parents and Carers Forum (Rachel Trueman)

South Glos. Educational Psychology Service (Sarah Hayes)
SOUTH GLOSTERSHIRE COUNCIL (C JAMROSY)
South Gloucestershire (Mary O'Reilly)
SOUTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL (S Inglis)
SOUTH TYNESIDE ED PSYCHOLOGY SERVICE (SANDRA CALVERT)
South West Advisory Group for Disagreement Resolution. (JEAN MURREY, JO HUCKLE, NIK KNAPMAN)
SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY (T COOKE)
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Ian McFee)
SOUTHWARK COUNCIL . LA (Lola Williams)
SOUTHWARK PARENT CARERS FORUM (SANDRA LEE)
SPARROW, DONNA
SPECIAL NEEDS JUNGLE (DEBS ASPLAND)
Special School (Clair Carroll)
SSAT (The Schools Network) Ltd (Jessica Nash)
ST HELENS PARENT CARERS FORUM
St James's catholic high school (Elizabeth Burns)
St John's C of E Primary School (Caroline Smith)
St. Christopher's School (Orna Matz)
St.John's School & college (Ron Babbage)
STAFFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (MARK SPROSTON)
Staffordshire Parent Action Network (Ann Langdale)
STAFFORDSHIRE UMBRELLA GROUP PARENT PARTNERSHIP. (MARIE WOOD)
Standing, Julie (Bucks County Council)
Stedham Primary (Sally Dreckmann)
Stewart, Alan (Individual)
Stockley, Sue (Castle Hill CP School)
Stockport Local Council (A Simpkins)
STOCKPORT PARENT PARTNERSHIP (SONIA FLORENT)

STOCKTON ON TEES BORO COUNCIL (JANE HARVEY)
STOCKTON UNITED FOR CHANGE PARENT PARTICIPATION FORUM (Carol Wilson/Diane williams)
STOKE ON TRENT LOCAL AUTHORITY (M Povey)
Stone, Patricia
Stoneman, Elaine
Stoney, Jan
Suffolk County Council (Christina Lewis)
SUFFOLK LOCAL AUTHORITY (C HOOKER)
SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL ED PSY TEAM (A PRICE)
Supportive Parents (Maggie Potter)
Supportive Parents - Bristol Parents Group (Davina Evans)
Supportive Parents Parent Partnership Service (Jackie Oxley)
Supportive Parents PPS, South Gloucestershire (Kathryn Mason)
Surrey County Council (Samantha Wilson)
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL, LOCAL AUTHORITY (Z LOWE)
Sutcliffe (SENSE), John
SUTTON PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE (Jane Pemberton )
SUTTON PARENTS FORUM (Jane Knowles)
Swift, Martina (Central Foundation Girls' School)
Swindon Borough Council (Gill Ilic)
TACTYC: Association for the Professional Development of Early Years Educators (JANET GEORGESON)
Tate & Bradley, Alison & Sean
Taylor, Allison (Education)
Taylor, Marianne
TEAM Wakefield Parent Forum (Catherine Lacy)
TEENAGE CANCER TRUST (C BROCKELHURST)
Telford & Wrekin Council (Karen Levell)
Thomas, Jenny (Murston Junior School))

Thompson, Sue (Axe Beacon Federation)
Thompson, Paula
Todd, Vikki (Great Marlow School)
TOGETHER FOR SHORT LIVES (JAMES COOPER)
Together Trust (Mel Darlington)
Tonbridge Grammar School (M Hull)
TORBAY COUNCIL (MARIANNE LEWIS)
Torbay Parents Participation Forum (Chris Sumner)
Tower Hamlets local authority (DAVID CARROLL)
Tower Hamlets support for Learning Service (Liz Vikerie Roland Ramanan)
Treloar's (John Stone)
Tri-borough -(London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham,Kensington,Chelsea, Westminster (Steve Comber)
Trott, Alison
Twinkies (Kirstie Stericker)
Twist, Susan (St Crispins Infant School)
Umberella (Nigel Farrow)
Unadkat , Varsha (Private daycare or nursery)
University of Northampton, The (Philip Garner)
UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM (ANNE EMMERSON )
Veerasubramanian, Jacqui
VIEW and Surrey CC (Judy Sanderson)
Voice (Ian Toone)
Wakefield LOCAL AUTHORITY (Marrium Haque)
Walsh, Miquela
Waltham forest parent forum (Carol Prideaux)
Wandsworth Council (Carol Payne)
WANDSWORTH PARENT CARER FORUM
Wandsworth Parent Partnership Service (Rina Patel)

Ward, Sarah (watling forest club)
WARGRAVE HOUSE SCHOOL AND COLLEGE (SHEILA JAEGER)
WARRINGTON BORO COUNCIL (HARRIET WILKINS)
WARWICKSHIRE INTERGRATED DISABILITY SERVICE (jane Carter)
Watson, Tim
Webb, Jeannette
West Kirby Residential School (Phil Crossley)
West of England High Needs Student Stratgy and Provisory Group (Kate Potter)
West Sussex County Council (Stuart Gallimore)
WEST SUSSEX PARENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE. (HEATHER McINTOSH )
WESTMINSTER EARLY YEARS ADVISORY TEAM (DANIELLA MORRISON )
Weston, Alexina (NHS North East Essex CCG)
WHARTON , JULIE (PERSONAL RESPONSE)
Whitehead, Clare (Foreland Inclusion Support Service)
Who Cares? Trust, The (Chloe Cockett)
Wigan Council (Steve Walker)
Wigan Educational psychology service (R Simpson )
William Tyndale Primary School (Tanya Watson)
Williams, Doreen (Childminder)
Williams, Ross (southampton city council)
Wingate Infant School (Marie-Louise Binks)
WIRRAL LOCAL AUTHORITY (P M ARISTA)
Witherslack Group Ltd, The (Mike Davey)
Wokingham Borough Council (Clare Dando)
Wolfe, Judith (St Wilfrid's RC College)
Wollen, Elseph
WOLVERHAMPTON PARENT PARTNERSHIP (LUCY HARRISS)
Woolley, Richard
Worthing High School (Sarah Lamba)

Wraparound Partnership (Elizabeth Stanley)
Wynne, Lucy (parent)
Young , H
YOUNG EPILEPSY (Emily White)

## Annex D – Full list of respondents to the spring 2014 consultation<sup>18</sup>

<b>Organisation</b>
Stone, John
Bowyer, Alex
Rousseau, Lindsey
Foster, Melanie
Park , Nicola
4Children (Steven Toole)
Aba4all (Jane McCready)
Achievement for All 3As (Sonia Blandford)
Achieving for Children providing children's services in Kingston and Richmond (Simon James)
Afasic (Alison Huneke)
Alliance for Inclusive Education (Simone Aspis)
Ambitious About Autism (Kate Williams)
Ambitious about Autism (Kate Williams)
Ashton Sixth Form College (Nigel Rennison)
Association of Colleges (Heather Pike)
Association of Educational Psychologists (Gary Jones)
ATL (Alison Ryan)
Bangs, John (Surrey county Council)
Beasley, Deborah
Bebbington, J
Beeden, Richard (ASENT)
BMDC Children's Services (Bill Turner)
Boothman, Catherine
Bradford College (Suzanne Hinchcliffe)

---

<sup>18</sup> Respondents who asked for their details to be kept confidential are not included on this list. This list is a direct download from the Department's online consultation system so respondent's details appear as they have identified themselves when responding to the consultation.

Breaking Barriers (Jacqui Byland)
Bridgwater College (Mike Robbins)
British Association for Community Child Health (Ben Ko)
British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD) (Paul Simpson)
Buckinghamshire County Council (Mike Appleyard)
Buxton and Leek College (Tim Birch)
Calderdale Parents and Carers (Janine Wigmore)
Cambridgeshire County Council (Jane Ryder Richardson)
Carers Trust (Anna Morris)
Carers UK (Chloe Wright)
Carter, Jenny
Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE) (Artemi Sakellariadis)
Chailey Heritage Foundation (Helen Hewitt)
Chase Lane Primary School & Nursery Unit (Julie Field)
Cheshire West and Chester Council, Head of Achievement and Wellbeing (Charlotte Fenn)
Cheshire West SEN Heads Association (Samantha Myers-Whittaker)
Children's Society, The (Jenny frank)
Clemenson, Peter (Parent)
CLIC Sargent (Helen Gravestock )
cliffe, wendy (parent partnership oxfordshire)
Communication Trust, The (Jo Bolton)
Communication Trust, The (Anne Fox)
Contact a Family (Una Summerson)
Council for Disabled Children (Chris Rees)
Coventry City Council (Roger Lickfold)
Crabbe, Biff
Cued Speech Association UK (Anne Worsfold )
Darlington College (Tim Grant)
Davies, Louise (Dyslexia Association of Staffordshire)
Derwen College (Louise Keevil)

Devi, Anita (www.AnitaDevi.com)
Dillon, Jayne
Doncaster Deaf Trust (Alan Robinson)
Doncaster MBC (Linda Calverley)
Dyslexia-SpLD Trust, The (melanie Byrne)
East Riding Parent/carer Forum (ERVIP) (Shirley PETHICK)
Elman, Roberta
Enfield Parents & Children, Enfield Parent Partnership Service (Linda Pryor)
EPIC Leeds (Beth Harper)
Epilepsy Action (Nicole Crosby-McKenna)
Essential Mediation (Manda Sides)
Fairfield Farm College (Janet Kenward)
FE College (Tracey Baron)
Forgan, sharon (FACT Bucks)
Fortune Centre of Riding Therapy, The (Jennifer Dixon-Clegg)
Furlong, John
Furlong, Julia (Parent)
Gregory, Jane
Grimsby Institute (Vikkie Morton)
Gross, Jean
Hampshire Parent Carer Network (Sharon Smith)
Hampshire Parent Partnership Service (Elaine Fish)
Harris, Carole (Parent)
Hedge, W (Achieving for Children)
Hereward College (Sheila Fleming)
Hill, Lesley (North Warwickshire & Coventry Dyslexia Association)
Holliday , Nannette (Parent)
Home Education Advisory Service (Jane Lowe)
Hughes, Michael
hunt, peter
Hyman, Hazel (Individual)

Independent (Gail Trembl)
Independent Schools' Council (Sunena Stoneham)
Information Commissioner's Office (Victoria Setinkaya)
IPSEA (Chris Gravell)
ISCG (Margaret Jones)
Jeffries, Clare (Mill Hill County High School)
Jenner, Simon (Blackpool Council)
Jhamat, Sukhvir (London Borough of Hounslow)
Jorgensen, Christine (Bath & NE Somerset PPS)
Kent Parent Carer Forum (Sarah Selby-bird)
Kirklees Council (Gill Ellis)
Lacewood Primary (Jeannette Stratton)
Leeds City College (Diane Wilson)
Leggett, Joe (Independent)
Leicester Parent Carer Forum (Dave Nutting)
Leith, Kerensa
Lewin, Jane (Federation of St. Godric's RCVA Primary School, Thornley & St. Mary's RCVA Primary School, Wingate, The)
Lincolnshire County Council (Sarah Dalton)
Linkage Community Trust (Matthew Orford )
LITTLE, SHEILA
Local Authority (Jeannette Essex)
Local Government Association (Liz Hobson)
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (Jacqueline Ross)
London Borough of Bexley (Janine Wooster)
London Borough of Brent (Maria Lunt)
London Borough of Croydon (Trisha Holmes)
Manchester City Council (Ann Thornber)
Markwell, Janet (Parent Partnership Service)
Mason, Gaynor
Maxwell Gillott Solicitors (Elaine Maxwell)

McKay, Maureen (Middlesbrough Council)
mcmahon, Anne
Mencap (James Robinson)
Miller, Sue (Parent partnership Service)
Moran, Hayley (Parent)
Morgan, Carol (Buckinghamshire Learning Trust)
Myerscough College (Ann Turner)
nasen (Jane Friswell)
National Association of Hospital and Home Teaching (Cath Kitchen)
National Autistic Society (dan leighton)
National Deaf Children's Society, The (Ian Noon)
National Development Team for inclusion (Nicola Gitsham)
National Governors' Association (Rani Kaur)
National Parent Partnership Network (Daisy Russell)
National Portage Association (Tracy Stephenson)
National Star College (Kathryn Rudd)
National Union of Teachers (Judy Ellerby)
Natspec (Alison Boulton)
Neale, Stephen (Beatrix Potter School)
New College Durham (Alyson Shields)
Newby, Wendy (St Roses School)
Nicholson, Fiona (Edyoursself)
NNPCF (Sarah Thomas)
Noel Quinn Ltd (Judith Jones)
norris, helen (Bromley Pathfinder/ Pathfinder Champion)
Northampton College (Pat Brennan-Barrett)
Nottinghamshire Pathfinder (Mark Evans)
Onions, S
Orchard Hill College (Caroline Allen)
Parent Partnership (Susn Miller)
PARTICIPATE (Rachael Gardener)

Pearce, Carol (RBWM)
Pemberton, Lucy (None)
Pennine Camphill Community (Steve Hopewell)
Pepler, Lorna
Pinpoint Cambs ( Sue Platt)
PODS (Parents Opening Doors) Parent Carer Forum (Jayne Stevens)
Porter, Karen (Calderdale College)
pre-school learning alliance (nicola gibson)
Prendergast, Brenda
prescott, geoffrey
Preston's College (Andrew Hulme)
Queen Alexandra College (Hugh Williams)
Rainbow Parent Carers forum - Nottingham City (Dawn McCarthy)
REACH Wokingham (Judith Newman)
Real Psychology Ltd (Philip Prior)
REVILL, VANESSA
RNIB (Julie Jennings)
rochdale parent forum (Kathryn Bromfield)
Rotherham Council (Zahid Qureshie)
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (Rhidian Jones)
Royal College of Psychiatrists, The (Helen Phillips)
Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (Mark Hope)
Royal National College for the Blind (RNC) (Lucy Proctor)
Sanderson, Helen
SE7 Parent Carer Fourms (Lara Roberts)
Selby-Boothroyd, Marianne
SEN Parent Partnership Service (Nick Taynton)
SENDac Special Educational Needs advice and consultancy (john keever)
SENSE (Steve Rose)
Sheffield Parent Carer Forum (Eva Juusola)
Silberrad, Phin

Smart, M L
South Essex College (Karen Fox)
Special Education Consortium and Standing Committee for Youth Justice (Katy Weeks)
Special Educational Consortium (Matthew Dodd)
Stackhouse, Julia
Staddon , Hannah (Bournemouth & Poole College)
Stafford, Alex
Stevens, Becky
Suffolk County Council (Christina Lewis)
Surrey County Council (Susie Campbell)
Surrey Early Years and Childcare Service, including Surrey Early Support Team (Eleri Morley)
Swindon Borough Council (C Esmonde-White)
Taylor, Pauline (Parent.)
Teenage Cancer Trust (Caroline Brocklehurst)
Telford College of Arts & Technology (Fionnuala Wiliams)
Together for Short Lives (James Cooper)
Totton College (Mike Gaston)
Voice;the union for education professionals (Ian Toone)
Vuckovic, Claire (Shropshire Council)
Wakeling, Sue
Ward, Amanda (East Riding of Yorkshire Parent Partnership Service)
Wargrave House School & LEAP College (Sheila Jaeger)
Warren, Tony (RNIB College Loughborough)
WESC Foundation: the specialist centre for visual impairment (Haydn Thomas)
West Sussex Parent Carer Forum (Lara Roberts)
Wiles, Hannah
Williams, Beverley (GCC)
Wood-Robinson, Romany
World of Inclusion (Richard Rieser)
Young Epilepsy (Emily White)



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v2.0. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2)  
email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)  
download [www.gov.uk/government/consultations](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations)

Reference: DFE-00452-2014



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)